282
Ilu

ULTRAMONTANISM

EXEMPLIFIED IN

IRISH DISAFFECTION,

IN

THE ACTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY,

AND IN THE DOCTRINES

OF THE

JESUIT SUAREZ,

AND OTHERS LATELY REFERRED TO AS LIGHTS OF HIS CHURCH
BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

WITH A TRANSLATION IN FULL OF

MONITA PRIVATA,

OR SECRET ADVICES OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS.

BY G. W. I.

DUBLIN:
THOMAS WEBB, 47, LOWER SACKVILLE-STREET.
1868.

ULTRAMONTANISM

EXEMPLIFIED IN

IRISH DISAFFECTION,

IN

THE ACTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY,

AND IN THE DOCTRINES

OF THE

JESUIT SUAREZ,

AND OTHERS LATELY REFERRED TO AS LIGHTS OF HIS CHURCH
BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

WITH A TRANSLATION IN FULL OF

MONITA PRIVATA,

OR SECRET ADVICES OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS.

BY G. W. I.

DUBLIN:
THOMAS WEBB, 47, LOWER SACKVILLE-STREET.
1868.

PURDON, BROTHERS, PRINTERS, 23, BACHELOR'S WALK, DUBLIN.

282
Ilu

ULTRAMONTANISM.

Of the many things that concern men, those which are supposed to be in any-wise connected with what is called religion, interest them least; and we would be safe in saying that for this cause, of all who are familiar with the word at the head of this page, very few comparatively have taken the trouble to inquire into, or to arrive at a correct conception of what it means; many of those even who have given it a passing consideration regarding it as only the designation of some species of High-Church Romanism, indulged in by a few priestly fanatics, who take an extreme view of the dignity of their profession, or of the status of their hierarch—a species of religious enthusiasm or folly, about which they need not in the least trouble themselves. Were such persons informed that Ultramontanism is very different from this, demanding at the present time the deliberate and serious consideration of all, without reference to denomination, as being calculated to affect their political, even more than their religious condition; that it is the developement of a deep-laid, craftily planned, and well-organized conspiracy, so far as it is possible to subjugate society to the domination of priestcraft; they might possibly take more interest in the subject; and if further informed that they can obtain an insight into the character of the system with little trouble on their part; that it may be found in the following pages; they might, perhaps, be induced to devote some spare hour to make themselves better acquainted with that which, under existing circumstances, it is especially desirable neither Protestant nor Catholic should be ignorant of.

In order to render the task of acquiring this most necessary information as little onerous as possible, Ultramontanism will be herein presented intelligibly and briefly, at the same time sufficiently; obviating any necessity to the general reader for referring at much cost of time to larger works, to extract from them what may be herein found condensed within the compass of a few pages.

Ultramontanism has been defined as "the endeavours of the Roman

27 Mar. 28 Caylor
p 56391

Curia to extend the Papal authority and destroy the consequence of national churches, to render the Catholic churches of the various countries more subservient to the Pope than is compatible with the laws of those countries, with the rights of their bishops and sovereigns, with the independence and intellectual freedom of each country, and even with various elements of Catholicism itself." This being limited to the quasi-religious phase of the subject, and leaving entirely out of consideration its political aspect, is as a definition wholly inadequate, and yet we are unable to find any other more to the purpose. Ultramontanism is simply Popery—a system which is distinct and distinguishable by most marked features from Roman Catholicism. It is a scheme, essentially secular, although professedly religious, contrived and prosecuted for the attainment by Romish ecclesiastics of political power whereby to work out their designs; a scheme for augmenting the mundane possessions and authority of the bishops of Rome, for aggrandizing the ecclesiastical corporation, and exalting the Papacy to a position of recognised supremacy over all other earthly powers. It is a warfare under covert of religion against all independence of action and freedom of intellect, in the success of which is involved the mental and moral decline of all that succumb to it, and of which the members of the Jesuit association have, since the foundation of their order, been the most strenuous and unscrupulous supporters. Faithfully delineating this scheme, we would submit it to Protestants for their instruction, and to Catholics, upon whom it is at present being impressed, for their consideration; that regarding it as it has been developed in the writings of Jesuit theologians, long laid aside, but now reproduced by the heads of the Roman Church in Ireland, they may consider whether it is for their advantage to be turned back from Catholicism to a mediæval Popery, or subjected and their children after them to the discipline of a Loyola, and moulded to the principles of men who, while iving, were by their co-religionists in Catholic France and elsewhere execrated and condemned as pests to society, and at one time or another expelled* from every state in which they had been allowed to locate

* The Jesuit Society, founded in 1534, and sanctioned by Pope Paul III. in 1540, was expelled from England 1581, France 1594, Portugal 1598; England again 1604; France again 1606; Venice 1606; England again 1610; Russia 1717; Portugal again 1759; France again 1762-3; Spain 1767; Genoa 1767; Venice again 1767; Sicily 1767; Naples 1768; Malta 1768; Parma 1768; all, with the exception of England and Russia, being strictly Roman Catholic States. Eventually the order was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. in 1773; but continued to exist under other names, and, disguised under the title of "Brothers of the Faith," it re-entered France,

themselves, because of their immoral, impious, pernicious, and anti-social doctrines, and homicidal counsellings and justifyings, from some of whom, lately referred to by Dr. Cullen as standards of orthodox illumination to the Church throughout all ages, we shall, before we conclude, bring forward under their own hands, and in their own words, what are generally regarded as the most atrocious and truculent teachings of Ultramontane Jesuitism.

It is not a truth, though asserted lately by an Ultramontane writer, that the present Pope Pius IX., as the chief glory of his Papacy, commenced, matured, and perfected the Church's doctrine of civil princedom; on the contrary, that is a doctrine which had been dogmatically taught, centuries before his time, by his predecessors, and centuries past, when the assumption became intolerable in its excesses, had been spurned and condemned as an insolent encroachment of Papal arrogance, even by princes and peoples who yet acknowledged ecclesiastical obedience to the bishops of Rome; but it is a truth that, attempting to take advantage of the religio-political complications of the present period, the representatives of the Ultramontanists of a former age are again putting forward the antiquated Papal claim to a universal supremacy, and having resumed the rusted weapons of the past, are making use of them to assail every principle of social, civil, or religious freedom of thought, word, or action, and vainly endeavouring to extinguish every spark of intellectual light, not of their kindling, among the laity of the Catholic Church. Ultramontanism, resuscitated by them for aggressive enterprize, not only demands to the attainment of its purposes the instant, unhesitating, unreserved obedience of Catholics in things secular as well as religious, but has the temerity to confront the intelligence, the civilization, the science, the mental development, and even the Protestantism of the nineteenth century, as though the world had no record of its former procedure, or of its result, in the extreme mental debasement, or in the amount of scepticism, infidelity, and atheism, the rank immorality, or the stupid superstitions, coupled with intolerant bigotry, which, instead of Christianity, it had generated throughout the Italian Peninsula, and in those Continental countries that had, like Italy, been for any lengthened period under the direct domination or influence of the Papacy: it seems disposed to beset us on

and had there several colleges in its hands, which were closed in 1828 some of them have since been reopened, and within the last twenty years the number of persons belonging to the order has been doubled. The Society, notwithstanding its abolition by Pope Clement XIV., was re-established by Pope Pius VII in 1814.

every side, and to challenge us from every quarter. Thus constrained to notice it, we do so, hoping that by exhibiting it in its true character we may be, to some small extent, instrumental in impeding it in its work of cozening uninstructed or unguarded Protestants, ignorant of its nature, and entertaining erroneous ideas as to what constitutes liberalism ; or converting truly liberal, tolerant, and inoffensive Catholics into narrow-minded, truculent, and bigoted Papists.

To prevent misapprehension, we would observe that the term "Papist" in these pages is not therein used inconsiderately or offensively, but as the distinguishing denomination of an individual of the Ultramontane sect of the Church of Rome, in which is included, with very few exceptions, the entire of the present Romish hierarchy, the ultra-Popish party—those who contend for the supremacy of their Sovereign Pontiff in things temporal as well as spiritual—adhering to the Jesuit Fathers especially as their preceptors and guides. Distinct from that is a much larger section, including within it the learned, the enlightened, and the liberal in the Catholic Church of every age and country, who, though acknowledging an ecclesiastical primacy and authority in the Roman Pontiff, have consistently and continuously repudiated his pretensions to supremacy in temporal matters outside his own kingdom. In this large and predominant section might be found the Gallican Church for centuries—the Faculty of Theology of Paris—comprehending the most ancient and Catholic College of Sorbonne, several of the Continental Catholic Colleges and Universities, very many of the Catholic Churches of Europe, the Catholic Church of Britain, and also (according to their own profession) the entire Catholic Church of Ireland up to a very recent period, as frequently exemplified in formal declarations of her nobility, clergy, and laity ; who maintaining, in political affairs, the duty of obedience to civil laws rather than to ecclesiastical *dicta*, and that the supreme power in secular matters vested in the Sovereigns of their respective countries, and not in anywise in a Roman Pontiff, we, for like distinction sake, designate Catholics—a distinction which should not be lost sight of, as there are very many things chargeable against the Jesuit or Papist sect of the Church of Rome which could not, without insult, injustice, or impropriety, be attributed to Catholics, who, either as good fellow citizens or as loyal subjects, have been found to be in nothing behind those of any other religious denomination.

It is worthy of notice that while an Ultramontane hierarchy obtrusively proclaims the universality of the temporal power of their Sovereign Pontiff as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, of whose kingdom, say

they, there shall be no end, the rejection of his authority by his own subjects, and the overthrow of his power even in Rome, has only been delayed by a foreign army occupying the city in overwhelming force, and the rifles and bayonets of French soldiers aiding the mercenary levies or brigand volunteers of the Vicar of Christ (?) in shedding the blood of Italians to keep the Successor of St. Peter seated upon an earthly throne, while on every side of him in Italy he can only behold those who have cast off his yoke, or are looking for deliverance from that "benign" rule which has become hateful to all but ecclesiastics or those subsisting upon them. At the same time, never were more unscrupulous, insidious, and unceasing efforts made for the recovery and re-establishment of the waning influence of the Papacy, for bringing individuals within its unrelaxing gripe, for effecting encroachments upon civil and religious freedom, and overturning or undermining every constitutional principle or Protestant institution of our country than by Ultramontanists at the present moment, as if what had been lost in Italy were to be recovered in Ireland. That inordinate lust of dominion which first tempted a Bishop of Rome to exalt himself and his authority above the co-ordinate authority and jurisdiction of other independent Bishops and Churches, and, in the lapse of time, by a further audacity, above the titles of Kings and Emperors, having been repelled by aroused and indignant Princes and Nationalities, and for a long period lain dormant, is again obtruding itself upon the world; that usurpation of power which in its former extravagancy constrained, even during a darker age, Catholic States and Sovereigns to cast aside all puerile apprehensions and superstitious fears of Pontifical anathemas, excommunications, and interdicts, and trample under foot the impious pretensions of Pontifical usurpers, is again venturing from the obscurity to which it had been sequestered, to occupy any and every position that in the least promises to be favourable to its development; and the Hildebrandine assumption, so obstinately adhered to by all succeeding Pontiffs, though frequently exploded, has presented itself in its *renaissance* state for recognition in Protestant Britain, where Pius IX., by his delegates, has demanded the remodeling or radical alteration, to suit Papal purposes, of laws and institutions of the British Empire, attaching to the demand the insolent intimation—"The Holy Father will be satisfied with no less," and a leading Minister of the Crown was found so degenerate as to accept such unconstitutional dictation, and so degraded as to sacrifice the dignity of his position and the honour of his Government, and to enter into a base intrigue with Papal agents for a conces-

sion of the demands of their Sovereign Lord the Pope, having in view the organic change or destruction of institutions, sanctioned, established, and extended by successive Parliaments of Great Britain, or the creation of others, exclusively Romanist, to compete with them in the interests of the Papacy, and to be strengthened for the contest by an authorisation, filched from under the hand of his Royal mistress, and by subsidies to be diverted to such a purpose out of the Imperial treasury—the inevitable result of which should be, to place the education, as well secular as religious, of Catholics in Ireland under the unreviewed direction and entire control of the Papal delegate—one who presents the Jesuits Bellarmin and Suarez to his clergy as the most brilliant lights of their Church; men who justified regicide and laboured to inculcate the most extreme, intolerant, detestable, and anti-social tenets of Jesuitism; which were, moreover, essentially disloyal and antagonistic to any other than a Papal supremacy.

Active, intriguing, and insidious though the Ultramontane Jesuit may be, and even though fostered and assisted by time-serving ministers; we cannot apprehend, under any present or future contingency, the development of Jesuitism to a like influence in the political affairs of Great Britain as in other countries, or at former times; still, it is capable of becoming a plague spot in our midst, and a great social nuisance; and were nothing more directly objectionable to follow from it in this country than the inculcation of the single Ultramontane maxim in reference to Papal supremacy—the conversion through its agency of any considerable portion of the Catholic subjects of a Protestant Sovereign into Papists, rendering them passive tools in the hands of an Ultramontane priesthood, and the setting up of another authority, an *imperium in imperio*, which they should be taught as an article of faith to regard as supreme to that of their Sovereign, and, at the same time, infallible in its pronouncements, which must be essentially repugnant to the principles of British Law, and intensely hostile to the maintenance of a Protestant Prince upon the throne, a Protestant Church, or a Protestant Constitution—an incalculable amount of evil would be the result, and an inexhaustible source of irritation and disturbance to the political and religious peace, progress, and well-being of society would be created. Such a propagandism is now in operation, while, either through apathy, ignorance, disloyalty, or indifference to historic facts and foregone experience, or through a traitorous submission to foreign dictates and extraneous pressure, those barriers* which the caution of our prede-

* The following very pertinent remarks of a most independent citizen of

cessors had raised against Papal encroachments through public offices and departments of State, or as abiding tests of acquiescence in, or repudiation of, the intolerable pretensions of Roman Pontiffs (which, if approved of by individuals, should disqualify them for every position of honor, or post of trust in any dominion but that of the Pope), have been one after another suffered to fall into disuse and decay, or on some specious, but spurious pretext, wholly prostrated and removed, in furtherance of Ultramontane designs to unprotestantize the British Constitution.

In the present spectacle of the Church of Rome in this country, we see the deception resorted to, when it was considered needful to conceal what was repulsive, to disarm objections, conciliate support, and obtain concessions from Protestants while in power, has been thrown aside, and the solemn oath of the Romish hierarchy of 1826 treated according to Jesuit principles, by the Romish hierarchy of 1867, as but a means to an end—"a virtuous act of dissimulation," justifiable and praiseworthy among that society which has reduced dissimulation, equivocation, and mental reservation to "A Commendable Art," as laid down for the instruction of their disciples by *Franciscus Toletus*, Cardinal and Jesuit, and others like him. We also witness the instillation of religious rancour and political strife between man and man, and of sectarian animosity into its members, against all who are not of the Church of Rome, even commencing with the youngest children at our public schools, by an illiberal and intolerant hierarchy, bound to their Sovereign Pontiff by an oath, "to defend, preserve, increase, and advance the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, and to persecute and fight against heretics, schismatics, and rebels to their said lord or his successors *as they may be able*;" and faithfully they fulfil their obligation according to their opportunity. Who, unless wilfully so, can be blind to the fact that the present disaffection of Ireland towards England derives its chief intensity, not

Dublin, in reference to the above. contain so much plain and sterling truth, that we repeat them in order to their more extensive circulation :—"Stripped of disguise, these objects (the removal of the tests) are to open to the priesthood a clear road to Romanize the Constitution of Great Britain by exposing to their control the few offices in this Protestant country which are restricted to Protestants; such as the Throne, the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, the offices of Lord High Chancellor, Commander of the Forces, and Lord High Admiral. Abolish the tests agreed on in 1829, and sweep away the Act of Settlement, and ere long there will be intriguing, as in the times of the Charleses and James II., to promote marriages between our Royal Family and Roman Catholic Princes, whereby to smuggle in Papal influences and practices.—*Letter of Alderman J. O. Bonsall in Daily Express.*

because of social or political inequalities, which have ceased to exist, except in episcopal pastorals, or the stump oratory of those who, unabashed, retail the figments of those pastorals to the multitude as truths, but from a long nurtured hostility to Protestantism, working by such agencies? and that the political inquietude, and incipient rebellion, in which Ireland has been kept seething, is so evidently manipulated by the leading ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome, toward the attainment of a certain end, that end being the overthrow of the Established Church, the elimination of every Protestant characteristic from the Constitution of this country, and the infusion of Ultramontane principles through an educational machinery to be set in motion within closed chambers by the irresponsible agents of the Papacy; that it is impossible to dissociate the end from the means, or to disregard the significant assertion made upon his trial by one of the convicted conspirators of 1866—that "he was aware before his arrest, negociations were being carried on between the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Government, concerning demands made by the former, attended by promises of further concessions by the latter: that concessions in Ireland had ever been the result of this same Fenianism, in one shape or another, which had always preceded such demands, and been followed by such concessions; and if the truth should be made known, it would be found that Fenianism had had its weight at this time as on former occasions." It would be only requisite to look over the pastorals and addresses as they have appeared in the public journals, from time to time, in order to become acquainted with the methods by which their authors have irritated and excited the multitude to the very verge of revolution; exasperating them by a recapitulation of old and defunct grievances, or of present imaginary wrongs, insults, and oppressions; and then to observe the subsequent efforts of the same individuals to turn sedition so incited to account; to feel justified in asserting that, as inculcators of social and sectarian animosities, and of distrust between man and his fellow, as disseminators of discontent to be used to their own advantage, as sanctioning and encouraging disloyalty, by crowning as martyrs those who suffer for crimes committed in furtherance of revolutionary projects, the Roman prelates and priests in Ireland have been labouring incessantly for years to make the government of Ireland an impossibility, except through their instrumentality as the recognised leaders of a disaffected people; that availing themselves of the political agitations of the country, as they attempted to do during the apprehensions of an outbreak in 1866, and making a market of their pretended power to control such disquietude,

they might obtain from timid or tottering ministries, the sacrifice, one after another, of everything objected to by them, as incompatible with the rights of the Holy See; until becoming more daring through repeated, impolitic, and unconstitutional submission to their requirements, they had lately the audacity, in the full confidence of the effect of the revolutionary development of what is called Fenianism upon a weak government, to annex to their demands, menaces, such as those uttered by a Romish dignitary;* that—"If not conceded (the abolition of the Established Church, &c.), the British Government will always have the Irish people what they are now, disaffected; that unless the Government *conciliated by concessions the spiritual leaders of the Irish people*, they will have Ireland with deep and widespread disaffection pervading the population of at least three out of its four provinces, with a large number of the Irish people ready to rush into insurrection at any hazard; and a far greater number willing, if they could with safety, to do the same."

Such then and so intimate is the connection between Irish sedition and the promotion of Ultramontane projects against Protestants and their religion, that it is no longer possible to ignore the alliance of Ultramontanism with Fenianism, or what it implies; which is simply this—that the country is to be continued in a state of smouldering rebellion, to be let loose into open insurrection at any moment that may appear opportune, unless the spiritual leaders of the Irish people are granted what they demand; unless Protestantism be banned, discouraged, and trodden down; unless the Protestant Church be rooted out, the Church of the Papacy be strengthened, the dominion of the Pope in Great Britain officially recognised, and all of what are termed confiscations restored to those who claim or think they have a right to them. Who is there that can speak with higher authority on the subject than the leaders of the people, who guide the movement and know so well the direction that is to be given to it? If anything more were required to prove the intimate connection of Ultramontanism with the revolutionary movement, and how hollow and worthless would be, even if pronounced, any ecclesiastical denunciation of Fenianism, it has been abundantly afforded in the procedure of the Romish prelates and priests on the execution of the Manchester murderers, whom, because of the connection of their act with Fenianism, they publicly honored by special ceremonies of their religion, referring to them in their harangues to the

* The Rev. Dr. O'Brien, at the meeting calling itself the National Association of Ireland, held in Dublin, 23rd January, 1866.

people assembled in their chapels as "the three martyrs who had suffered death *for their faith* in Manchester."* Suffering for a traitorous Fenian atrocity and suffering for their faith being thus represented by the priest as identical.

But what, on their own showing, it might be fairly asked, is the result of years of attempted *conciliation by concessions to the Romish Hierarchy*, and the removal of all obstacles to their co-religionists attaining to political position and influence, and thrusting their nominees into every department of the State, and into offices of trust, of honor, and of emolument, from which the mere profession of Protestantism has, during the conciliation experiment, acting as a disqualification, excluded many more eligible candidates? Is Ireland more peaceable, prosperous, or loyal than it was before that experiment was commenced? The recipients of such favors proclaim the contrary. Much has been conceded to them, but it has only strengthened their hands, sharpened their appetites, and stimulated their craving for more, while the same means, set in motion to originate the agitation from which such an abundant harvest was gathered, is still continued, of which we have an example in a missive of Dr. Cullen,† published at the very moment when an eighteen years' seething of rebellion was on the point of boiling over, intended to palliate disloyalty, insult Protestants, and exacerbate the disaffected. The author of that Pastoral, addressing the Irish, according to his usual left-handed mode, through his clergy, reminded them that "Ireland had still *material grievances* to complain of, owing their origin to *persecution*, *confiscation*, and *the misrule of centuries*; that she was still compelled to submit to the *injury* and *insult* offered to her in the maintenance within her borders of a Church Establishment *hostile to her rights and religion*; that *for the small landholders there is no protection*, and '*godless systems of education are forced upon us.*'" We shall quote but one more sentence of the same grist from that Pastoral, exhibiting more than ordinary effrontery, because of its glaring inconformity to truth, which the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen ventured unblushingly to subscribe his name to, it is this—"*Ever since Catholic Emancipation, Catholics have been excluded from every office of trust and emolument.*" A statement so destitute of the slightest semblance to truth, that did we not particularize the Pastoral in which it may be found, we might be suspected of attempting,

* Rev. T. P. Shanahan, in St. Michael's Parish Chapel, Limerick, 8th December, 1867.

† See *Freeman's Journal*, 20th Oct., 1865.

through some alteration of his expression, to stigmatize the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin as a person who had not the least regard to veracity in his public addresses when his object was to excite or increase popular discontent—an assertion to which a direct contradiction can be given from every office and public Department in Great Britain, from the Irish Bench, and from the Council Chamber in the Castle of Dublin, and only to be paralleled by a statement of a similar character made a few days after, with a like soothing intent, by Monsignor Woodlock, on the authority, no doubt, of Irish history, as taught in the so-called Roman Catholic University, that "there was a time in Ireland when the same reward was offered for the head of the priest, the schoolmaster, and the wolf," which being contained in his letter to the Roman Catholic clergy, relative to the annual collection for his University in November, 1865, was published in all the Roman Catholic Chapels throughout Ireland as a gentle stimulant suitable to the occasion, and to that particular time. Such are the missiles of priests and prelates that, cast among the people, like poisoned shafts, have penetrated and envenomed the Irish breast, as it was purposed they should, until what might have been intended only to produce a social ferment—a demonstration of discontent and disaffection, aiding to the attainment of Ultramontane ends—assumed a more decided aspect, and it was, to the dismay of the promoters, discovered that those who have been long indoctrinated in disaffection to their Sovereign will pay little respect to their priest when once they commit themselves to the downward course of revolution. Besotted men, intoxicated by repeated doses of the stimulants administered to them, entered into an insane project to wrest their country from England, pointed out to them as "the oppressor:" some few lost their lives, very many their liberty in the attempt, while the instigators escaped unscathed. We shall not stay to moralise on the culpability of their leaders or to inquire from them what commensurate restitution is "a *requiem*" for "a life."

Passing on from the connection of Ultramontanism with Fenianism, and having next in view what may be, perhaps, even more important, namely, the identification of the Ultramontanism of Archbishop Cullen and the present Romish Hierarchy in Ireland with the vicious Jesuitism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it will be desirable to take a cursory glance at the organisation and conduct of the Jesuit Society that at its origin, vowing implicit obedience in all things to the Sovereign Pontiff, professed, as its objects, the propagation of religion, the conversion of heathens and heretics, and the education of youth: (such is

also the profession of Ultramontane ecclesiastics). The organisation, objects, and operation of that Society are the same now as designed by Loyola and matured by his immediate successors: the Jesuit is thoroughly a cosmopolite; a stranger to the religion of the cloister, he is at home in the vortex of secular matters, whereout may be drawn anything to the advantage of himself or his order, the elevation of his Sovereign Lord the Pope, the increase of the temporalities or authority of what is called "the Holy See," or the subjugation of mankind to priestcraft. Operating on politics, under the garb of religion, the members of the Order insinuate themselves and their influences into everything that might in anywise affect their objects, and accommodate themselves with well-skilled subtlety to the existing conditions of Society, regarding the indications of the times, studying the disposition of those of any standing or influence they come in contact with, instituting espionages to subserve their purposes, and availing themselves in ways innumerable of that most facile yet most potent of aids which is derivable from female confidences initiated in the confessional.

It has been aptly said by one of our Journalists that—"The present immediate object of the Ultramontane sect of the Church of Rome in this country is the acquisition by the priesthood of political power, and the subjugation through the means of schools and colleges, under the direction of the hierarchy, of the rising intellect of Ireland, to priestly domination in all things, whether they be social, political, or religious." This is, in fact, the developement of Jesuitism under a designation less offensive, because not yet generally recognized as the same in principle, though differing in name.

The disciplining of youth, which formed the basis for extending and perpetuating Jesuitism, holds the same position in the present Ultramontane scheme. The education of Catholics is no longer to be free of Ecclesiastical control in any particular, no longer to be allowed to continue as it was prior to the advent of Archbishop Cullen to the See of Dublin—a subject upon which parents might exercise a private judgment and a choice of teachers—a matter in which secular and religious preceptors might be recognized by them as fit, each to discharge certain duties independently of the other, but is now seized upon in the interests of Ultramontanism, for initiating young persons into principles similar to those imparted in the Jesuit novitiate.

We convey nothing new in saying that Jesuit power is founded on Jesuit discipline, and Jesuit discipline has for its foundation what is expressed in the one word, "Obedience;" still there are many who have yet

to learn what is the nature and extent of that abject prostration of the human intellect that is necessary to the "Obedience" of Jesuitism. No words of ours could so well define it as will an extract from the *Constitutions* of the Society, bearing directly on the subject.

In SUMMARIUM CONSTITUTIONUM of the Society, Lib. i., cap. iii., we read—

§ 31.—It especially helps at the outset, and is very necessary that all should commit themselves to a perfect obedience, recognizing the Superior (whoever he may be) as in the place of our Lord Jesus Christ, following him in internal reverence and love; nor should they alone obey in the external execution of those things he enjoins, entirely, promptly, vigorously, and with due humility; without excuses and murmurings, although he should order things which are disagreeable and repugnant, according to natural inclination (*sensualitatem*); but, moreover, they should endeavour internally to possess resignation and true abnegation of their own individual will and judgment, *entirely conforming their own will and judgment to that which their Superior wills and thinks in all things* (where sin is not perceived); the will and judgment of the Superior being proposed to themselves *as the rule of their own will and judgment*, whereby they may be the more exactly conformed to that first and highest rule of every good will and judgment, which in itself is eternal goodness and wisdom.

§ 32.—All should leave the unrestricted disposition of their own affairs with true obedience to their Superior, by keeping nothing concealed from him, not even their own consciences; neither resisting, nor contradicting, nor exhibiting in any way a private judgment opposed to his judgment, so that by oneness of opinion and will, and by due deliberation, they may be preserved, and progress better in Divine submission.

§ 33.—All should especially study to observe obedience, and to excel in it, not alone in things obligatory, but even in other things, although nothing else may be apparent than a sign of the Superior's will, without any express command; but God, our Creator and Lord, should be stayed before the eyes, on account of whom obedience is yielded to man; and care should be had that it should proceed in a spirit of love, and not with the perturbation of fear.

§ 34.—We are to be as prompt at the voice of a Superior as if it proceeded from Christ our Lord; any matter, even as a single letter of the alphabet, commenced by us, being relinquished before it has been finished.

§ 35.—We should direct all our powers and intention to that design in the Lord, that there may be in us a holy obedience, perfect in every part, as well in performance as in intellect; by obeying with the greatest despatch, spiritual joy, and perseverance whatsoever is enjoined on us; *by persuading ourselves that all things are lawful*, abnegating by a certain blind obedience (*cæca obedientia)* every opinion and idea of our own to the contrary.

§ 36.—Each should persuade himself that they who live under obedience should allow themselves to be borne and ruled by Divine Providence through their Superiors, as if they were a dead body (*ac si cadaver essent*), which allows itself to be borne hither and thither, and to be treated in any manner, or like the staff of an old man, which is subservient to him who holds it in his hand, wheresoever and for whatsoever purpose he wills to use it.

According to these Constitutions, it will appear that in the renunciation of intellect, the abnegation of any private will, or any perception of right or wrong, under the guidance of individual judgment or reason, and entire submission to the judgment and will of another, whose voice is to be obeyed even as that of Christ, promptly as the call of "the last trumpet" when it shall sound, lie the foundations of Jesuit power and operativeness; and it is to be observed that, although in Sec. 31 such obedience appears to be required only in things "wherein sin is not perceived;" by the Constitutions which follow, enlarging upon the character of the duty, this condition is rendered wholly nugatory; for Jesuits, or those under Jesuit discipline, are to entertain no perception, no ideas of their own, to form no judgment of their own, no matter what their perceptions might be, inconsistent with anything enjoined upon them. They are "neither to resist, contradict, nor exhibit in any manner a private judgment," but to be obedient in whatsoever is commanded, or even indicated to them, "*persuading themselves* that *all things* enjoined upon them by a Superior are lawful," to that end sinking, subjugating, denying, and repudiating, or, as it is written, "abnegating by a blind obedience," *cæca obedientia*, every opinion of their own to the contrary. The same is also enjoined in Loyola's celebrated epistle, *De Obedientiæ Virtute*, thus—"Those things which a Superior orders, they should simply accomplish in a blind obedience, and whatsoever he chooses, they should excel in, with a blind understanding, not considering whether or not what is commanded may be good or useful, not alone by not judging, and much less finding fault, with whatever a Superior orders, and such things as he chooses, *but*

even by presuming that they are good and holy things."* It will thus be apparent that with the Jesuit, if commanded by his Superior, there can be no influencing perception of sin, irreligion, or immorality, *in anything* so required of him. His Superior's order justifies and sanctifies the thing ordered, his vow constrains him to "obedience," wherefore the limitation of such obedience in the 31st sec. to injunctions "*wherein sin is not perceived*" is a mere deception, but so superficial as can only mislead the credulous, who, unconscious of what Jesuitism is, may not take the trouble of testing its truth.

In connexion with this principle of blind obedience, this pit of all licentiousness, *barathrum omnis nequitiæ*, as it has been fitly styled, the most entire mental, moral, and physical despotism is established in one over another throughout every grade of the order; hence the efficiency of Jesuit operation, which becomes a combined action not marred by divided counsels, dissent, or disobedience, but, like that of a well-adapted mechanism, actuated by one prime mover. The novitiate is a course of discipline calculated to deprive those who enter upon it of every particle of natural sentiment, manly feeling, or moral elevation, and to quench in them every scintilla of filial affection,† self-respect, individuality, or independence of thought, will, or action; requiring a frequent manifestation of conscience, a disclosure of the most secret thoughts, acts, or inclinations to a spiritual superior (who may make use of such disclosures, though originally made in Confession, if to publish them be more conducive to the advantage of the Society, in the ways indicated in *Monita Privata*), and also demanding from the novice, that, besides revealing his own most secret emotions, he should act the part of a spy upon the thoughts and tendencies of his associates, as same are evidenced in their private actions and expressions, whereby superiors may be able to attain a most intimate knowledge of the idiocrasies of all under their control, to make use of them accordingly.‡

* Ea quæ superior jubet cæca obedientia simpliciter perficiant; quæque ipse facit cæco judicio prætereant, non considerantes an bonum vel utile sit, necne, quod præcipitur; quæque superior jubet, quæque ipse facit, non solum, non judicando multoque minus reprehendendo: *sed etiam tamquam bona et sancta præsupponendo.—Epis. Ign. Loy. De Scholasticis et Novitiis.*

† Scholastics and novices are, entering upon the Cursus—*Mundum deserere seipsos abnegare, Bona sua relinquere, a Parentibus aufugere, Amicis valedicere, et ab omnibus quæ mundus amat abhorrere: naturalem Parentum affectum, in Spiritualem h. e. in Jesuitorum Sociorum amorem Convertere: omnium suum atque adeo sui-ipsorum quoque oblivisci.*

‡ It has been observed that youth, for any length of time under the exclusive control of Romish ecclesiastics or ecclesiastical discipline for education, with few exceptions, exhibits an abjectness and want of independence or manliness not observable in young persons under lay teachers—a condition of

Continuing the comparison between Jesuitism and Ultramontanism, we would say, that as the Jesuitism of the sixteenth century, so the Ultramontanism of the nineteenth is opposed to all individuality in its disciples; intolerant of the least independence of thought, will, or action, hostile to any phase of religion, which is not unmistakable Popery, and characterized by a like unceasing effort to control the education, so as to fetter the intellect of youth, imprinting upon it similar conditions of blind, unreasoning, unhesitating obedience: it would even comprehend within its grasp, and reduce under its domination, not the intellect of youth alone, but, if it were possible, the very souls and bodies of all, even of maturer age, not in circumstances to be indifferent to or to disregard its dictation, and with a crushing despotism would tyrannize over them not merely in matters of religion, but in their most ordinary secular operations. The means chosen by them for their intellectual improvement, their social assemblies, and their modes of recreation, even to the reading of an ordinary newspaper, dictating to the commercial clerk, the artizan, or the operative, as it would not presume to do to the educated and enlightened professional man, the wealthy merchant, or the independent employer: of the many instances of which frequently occurring, we refer to one of the latest, by way of example—that of the Belfast Catholic Institution, the managers or directors of which, having realized a sum of money by a sale of part of its property, and refusing to permit Dr. Dorrian, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor, to appropriate, "for the good of the church," a considerable portion of that which was more or less the property of each member of the Institute; and having afterwards occasion to reconstruct their Society, Bishop Dorrian interposed his Episcopal interdict against its re-formation, unless preceded by a most abject submission to his authority and dictation, and by subscription to the despotic conditions contained in the following rules, offered by him for their acceptance:—1st. The approval by the bishop (Dr. Dorrian) of such articles of associa-

mind quite distinct from docility, with which it has been attempted to confound it. This is corroborated by the complaint of Dr. Newman (before resigning his post in connexion with the Roman Catholic University) that "he found the greatest difficulty he had directly or indirectly to contend with was, *the want of an independent spirit* amongst the young men, such as ought to be expected from those who had a public school education."

If the natural spirit of a youth be too high to brook the system of such establishments, or to bear with the espionage and insults of the low-bred ushers, by whom their discipline is carried out, we have an example of the consequences. and an insight into the practices of institutions of this class exposed in the trial of Fitzgerald against the Principal of the Roman Catholic Seminary at Oscott.

tion as he shall judge satisfactory, and their adoption as the basis of any new company to be formed.

2nd. The same right on the part of the bishop (Dr. Dorrian) of approving the rules of management of lecture-hall, library, and news-room.

3rd. A veto by the bishop (Dr. Dorrian) on any member acting on the Directory (which would, of course, exclude all who would not place the treasury of the Society at his disposal) whose morals, religious principles, or habits of life, the bishop (Dr. Dorrian) may object to.

4th. The approval by the bishop (Dr. Dorrian), or one appointed by him, of all books and *newspapers* to be admitted for reading into the news-room or library, and the like approval of any lecturer to be invited to lecture for the members.

To which Dr. Dorrian added—"If these conditions be not made the basis of the institute, I wish to give fair notice that by whatever name the new institute may be called, and to change the name if such shall be in contemplation is not a very hopeful sign, I shall consider it my duty, for the protection of my people, *to debar from the sacraments* all and every one who may become a member, or aid in its construction; these securities for its proper management not being first provided."

Those who would be really observant of the character or progress of the present ultramontane propagandism may not only view it in many acts of episcopal tyranny similar to the foregoing, but discern it broadcast in that most extensive field for the propagation of any idea or the culture of any theory, namely, the daily press: a remarkable testimony to the importance attachable to which, when discreetly managed, has been lately afforded in the newspaper *Civilta Cattolica* being raised by a brief of the present Pope to the position and title of "Authorized Defender and Exponent of the Catholic Faith," its immediate duty being the dissemination and maintenance of the tenet already adverted to, namely, the pretended divinely instituted "Supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff over all temporal princes, and the independence of the Romish hierarchy and priesthood of all save ecclesiastical laws and jurisdictions." According to recent dispositions, the writers of *Civilta Cattolica* are to be entirely dependent upon the general of the Order or Society of Jesuits, and it does seem strange that with such evidence of the value of newspaper propagandism, the use made of it by men who are generally admitted to be wise in their generation, and the daily proofs of the effect of their principles leavening the *materiel* of every journal addicted to their interests, and insinuated into very many others commonly sup-

posed to be adverse to the extension of their influence or the increase of their power; such is the want of vigilance, of activity, of energy, or of a disposition to meet the occasion by those who should watch their procedure, expose their devices, and give warning of their advances, that we have, with very few exceptions, no protesting press, regularly or systematically devoting even a small portion of its space to the counter-action of Jesuit designs. Every thoughtful Protestant has, time after time, need to form a very low estimate indeed of what is called the Protestant press, for we have in truth, no protesting press adequate to the occasion in either England or Ireland; there is a mistaken delicacy of giving offence pervading to a very considerable extent what is called the Protestant press of this country, which leads it systematically to exclude unpalatable truths in relation to Jesuitism or Ultramontanism from its columns, under the stereotyped pretext that such are not suited to the columns of secular journals, though the secular journals at the other side in the service of Rome call for their expression, and prove that Jesuitism or Ultramontanism are altogether secular in their objects. We might even go so far as to say that there is a large portion of the press, while nominally under Protestant direction, and professing to support Protestant interests, so managed that it contributes little or no information on public matters of any kind that has not been filtered through a Jesuit medium,* as though even it were actually subsidized to the service of Rome, presenting in too many of its most prominent articles an insidious sapping of wholesome ideas and rightly formed antipathies to Popery. In it may be noticed an adulterate liberalism, deprecating for conciliation and a hollow and worthless peace sake any active or decided hostility to Romanism; as if such were under the superior refinement of the empty religious formalism and conventionalities of the present day; only an unpolished rudeness unsuited to the age, or

* The Marquis of Westmeath and the Press.—A writer in the *Press* and *St. James's Chronicle*, styling himself "Spectator," thus alludes to the recent proceedings in the House of Lords, when the Marquis of Westmeath complained that his speeches had been omitted by the reporters:—"The marquis does not complain without cause. The skill of reporting is unrivalled, but not so the moral integrity. Reporting is very much in the hands of clever, sharp Irish Catholics, trained at Maynooth, and they, with true loyalty to the Pope and their own priests, take care that the debates shall appear as little damaging to the conspiracy as possible. It is thus the public know so little of the Romish doings. Some time ago a very damaging speech against Papal policy was made in the Commons. A Romish member went up to the speaker, and said: 'You have made a hard speech against us; not a word of it will appear in the papers.' This applies to all kinds of newspaper reporting and writing. Information is suppressed, or it is garbled and coloured to suit a special purpose."

an evidence of inexcusable bigotry or intolerance of what was simply a religious and not much more a political matter : assuming, as if it were universally admitted, that Great Britain is in the wrong respecting the Romish prelates, and should at once endeavour to amend the wrong by now conceding to them whatsoever they may insist on having, representing the Romish hierarchy as supereminent in power and influence, and treating the ephemeral loyalty of the Irish priesthood (exhibited on the alarming development in Irish Fenianism of a spirit that has at last arisen to reject priestly dictation in political matters) as "an accidental alliance with the Government, giving occasion for *justice and generosity* towards that powerful body, such as might make the alliance permanent and hearty:"* an alliance, to secure which the most valued institutions of our country, the Church Establishment, and with it anything and everything that, being distinctively Protestant, is therefore offensive to a papal hierarchy, and every impediment in the way of Romanists to the highest offices of the State, should be got rid of; and to elevate Papists (miscalled Catholics) to a position of religious equality with Protestants, without which they are to be regarded as yet labouring under political disabilities; any still existing obstacles to the attainment of Ultramontane ambition—even the barrier in the way to the throne—should not be considered too great a sacrifice.

In another portion of the press, but honestly, because openly, adhering to the propagandists, Ultramontanism displays itself in statements

* It augurs well to see the effect on men of a little further experience of Ultramontanism. The above is the comment of the *Pall Mall Gazette* some short time ago on what it then treated as a demonstration of *loyalty* to the British Government on the part of the Romish hierarchy in their condemnation of Fenianism—a loyalty which some "just and generous concessions would ripen into a permanent and hearty alliance." In the same journal of 22nd November, 1867, we read—"Fenianism is denounced by the Pope not because it is directed against the British or any other government, whether Protestant or Catholic, but because it is the work of a secret society which administers oaths not sanctioned by Roman authority. English politicians too frequently misunderstand the action of the Romish clergy in this respect, *and count far too confidently upon their loyalty to the British Crown*, when they see them thus evidently zealous against a traitorous conspiracy: it ought never to be forgotten that the permanent and avowed reason for their enmity to these conspirators has nothing whatever to do with English or Irish national interests, but is solely the result of *the Papal claim to dictate to all Christians, of whatever nation, in all matters of right and wrong.* The Roman Church will endure no competitor near the throne; she claims to be the one organized corporation which is entitled to decide upon the lawfulness and validity of oaths; and every society, whether *social. political, or religious*, which keeps its proceedings secret, organizes itself in the dark, and binds its members by oaths, is, *ipso facto*, an embodiment of treason against the Papal supremacy." The editor of the *Gazette* has evidently acquired a considerable addition to his knowledge within the past year.

boldly put forward in the spirit of *Civilta Cattolica* like the following: "The Papal is that power which claims to *overrule* all other powers, and to approve or condemn the principles by which they live and move." Again, "the Pope has reached the highest limit of all earthly greatness; all nations do him service; of his kingdom there is no end. He has to stand between God and man upon a pinnacle alone."—*Tablet.*

In the daily journals we also see the authority of the Pope impressed by frequent reiteration on Roman Catholics, and paraded before Protestants, in such maxims as that enunciated by the Rector of the School called the Roman Catholic University of Ireland (following the pronouncement of the Florentine Council), thus:—"The Roman Pontiff is the father and teacher of *all Christians*, and neither you, nor I, nor any Catholic, layman or prelate, can set up his opinion against the Pope's authoritative judgment on a point regarding moral discipline." The moral discipline therein referred to being that involved in the act of a Catholic parent sending his child for education to any school or college not under the sole control of the Romish hierarchy, which thing being forbidden in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff, a Catholic parent is not to be governed by any judgment, inclination, or private consideration of his own, but to obey the mandate, or incur ecclesiastical denunciation, and the penalty of being debarred from the sacraments of his Church.

The same intolerant Ultramontanism may be found making its appearance in a more advanced state, and under a more permanent form, in elaborate treatises by learned and accredited theologians of Dr. Cullen's school, compiled and published for the guidance of those who are to instruct others. In one of those lately sent forth from the Irish press,* and eulogized beyond measure in the *Dublin Review* and other Romanist journals, as being "at the present time most acceptable, emanating from a writer so profoundly versed in ecclesiastical learning, so unexceptionably orthodox, and so devotedly loyal to the Holy See" as its author, the essayist, in his disputation on the Church in her capacity as "Ruler," renews what, though an insult to the intelligence of the present day, is perfectly consistent with Ultramontane or Jesuit doctrine—namely, that "the Church (defined in the same publication as the Pope and Bishops of the Church of Rome) possesses the power of *compelling* her subjects to observe her laws and judgments by FORCE."

In the *Westminster Gazette*, a late addition (under the especial

* Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi. Auctore Patricio Murray, D.D. Dublin: M'Glashan. 1865.

inspiration or review of a Popish prelate in England) to the Romanist journals of the day, we read:—"In countries (as Great Britain) unfortunately now no longer Christian (Roman Catholic), irreligious liberty must run riot, since it would be manifestly *unwise or inexpedient to punish religious error*, but fortunately at Rome a state exists where the civil law subserves, as we urged last week it should, the purposes of the Divine will, public heresy is a moral offence *to be punished by law*." Such is the principle to the vindication of which the tribunal of the Inquisition was established, and the secular arm so often invoked for the destruction of intractable heretics—a principle condemned by all having the slightest grounds for calling themselves Christians, and ignorantly supposed by many to have been abandoned by the Papacy; not so, however; it was only placed by it in abeyance, because, for a considerable time past, it would have been unwise, inexpedient, or even dangerous to attempt to act upon it, unless in places under the dominion of the Sovereign Pontiff; but it is now revived by the Romish hierarchy, commended by Jesuit theologians and Romish ecclesiastics, even in Great Britain, and openly acknowledged as one of the most approved and necessary of the many agencies of the Church of Rome; and faithful to its obligations, that Church as above defined (the Pope and bishops), were obstacles removed, or the time opportune, would, in its blind zeal, re-enact now in the nineteenth century the persecuting and sanguinary processes of the thirteenth and subsequent centuries for the extirpation of what it calls heresy. Who contradicts this, or asserts otherwise, not alone contradicts the current evidences of the hour, but imputes to the hierarchy of the Roman Church that which they utterly disavow—namely, indifference to, or abnegation of, what they consider incumbent on them, and have bound themselves by oath to perform, and what their every publication of the present day asserts as their right, and reiterates as their duty to enforce, only regretting that unfortunately in countries now no longer exclusively Christian it would be unwise or inexpedient (however desirable and right to do so) to compel obedience by *force* or to *punish religious error* by the secular arm as formerly. This may appear a strong expression of opinion, but can we say less when such a man as Cardinal Cullen, within the consecrated walls of his Cathedral in Marlboro'-street, could gloat with the true Dominican relish upon the slaughter of thousands of human beings, and assert it as his belief that the Apostle Peter was active in the work of human destruction, and proved that he was not deaf to the prayers of the Pontifical Zouaves, for their swords (to maintain the temporal

authority of his successor in the Papal Chair over a few square miles of this earth's surface) "*drank deeply of the blood of sacrilegious and infidel adventurers,*" who were all, professedly at least, members of his Church. What extremities if in power would Dr. Cullen disapprove of in a case of religious error, or where heretics, and not Catholic spoilers of this world's treasures or honours only, were the enemies to be destroyed, would, no doubt, depend upon the relative importance of the crime.

Dr. Cullen and his *confreres* must be intolerant of everything disagreeing with Popery; it is altogether impossible for Romanists to be true to the Papacy, and willingly to tolerate the profession of any other religion. An exposition of the principles established for their guidance in this matter will be found in the extracts from the writings of Jesuit theologians in the latter part of this publication, in reference to the extermination of heretics; and the same principles, showing the unchangedness of the system, will be found daily expressed in the plainest terms by Romanist writers. Let us hear a writer on the subject within the last few days in the following extract from the *Rambler*, one of the ablest organs of British Romanism at present in England, which runs in the very same tone of Vindeck, Becanus, and other Jesuits, who more than two centuries ago wrote on the same subject.

The *Rambler* says:—"We are the children of a Church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to the principles of 'religious liberty'" . . . "Many a Catholic really imagines himself to be a votary of religious liberty, and is confident that if the tables were turned, and the Catholics the uppermost in the land, he would, in all circumstances, grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself." . . . . "His object is to silence Protestants. He persuades himself he is telling the exact truth, &c. Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, for an instant, when you hear us pouring forth our liberalisms. Such a person is not talking Catholicism, but Protestantism and nonsense. You ask if he were lord in the land, and you were in the minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend on circumstances. If it would benefit Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient he would imprison you, banish you, fine you, possibly even he might hang you; but he would never tolerate you for the sake of the principles of civil and religious liberty." . . . . . "No. Catholicism is the most intolerant of all creeds. It is intolerance itself, *for it is the truth itself.* We might as rationally maintain that a sane

man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only to be equalled by its absurdity."

Such is the true spirit of Ultramontanism. The spirit of the Cullens, MacHales, Morans, and Lavelles of Ireland. He must be unobservant or inaccessible to evidences who believes otherwise; or presuming upon the credulity of others, who asserts anything at variance with these truths.

As a fitting conclusion to the foregoing, and as opening a way to a fuller interpretation of the Ultramontanism of Dr. Cullen's administration, we may observe that at the commencement of the year 1865 was carried on, in the Municipal Council of Dublin, one of the organised assaults of that date, upon what were then called "The Obnoxious Oaths," under the pretence that they were offensive and insulting to Catholics, as imputing to them a condition of the lowest moral and religious perceptions, in requiring them to abjure any belief in the power of the Pope to depose Sovereigns and to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, or that any prince, excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, might be put to death by his subjects or by any other person—tenets represented on that occasion to be altogether foreign to the spirit and principle of the Church of Rome, and which never had a foundation but in the hostile or perverted imaginations of bigoted and falsifying Protestants, or, if otherwise, had never been advanced by persons of any standing or authority among Roman Catholics, or recognised by their bishops or clergy: and possibly it was so believed by many of that moderately-educated assembly, whose opportunities or inclination for studying any impartial history of the past have, no doubt, with few exceptions, been very limited. On that occasion the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone, was quoted as having said in reference to the same—"It does, I confess, seem to me rather extraordinary to ask any man to say he thinks no man should be murdered; it is contumelious to require any man to repudiate such an opinion." This, we can perceive, though it might pass in such an assembly, was but a sophistical mode of treating the subject. The abjuration referred to involved, not as Mr. Gladstone would have it to appear, a simple condemnation of murder in the abstract, but a consideration, judgment, and condemnation, by the individual required to make it, of certain impious and immoral tenets of Ultramontanists and Jesuits, as incident to an act of the Sovereign Pontiff, and taught by them to be justifiable thereby; and the offensiveness of that abjuration to Papists (though not

to Catholics, who could freely, truly, and conscientiously make it) lay in its obligation to pronounce that to be impious, heretical, and damnable which Jesuit theologians have inculcated, which Popes have forced into execution, and which Ultramontanists to the present hour maintain, and not in any wounding of an over-nice sensitiveness through its presumed conveyance of a false imputation.

A few weeks had scarcely elapsed from the day on which the assembled Municipal Council of Dublin, strengthened as they supposed themselves to be by the sophistry of Mr. Gladstone, and aided by the elaborated declamation of a talented member of the Council, abounding in everything needful to the occasion but facts and history, were endeavouring to establish an argument for the abolition of the oaths referred to (since done away with), ere the Papal delegate in Ireland afforded proof, if such were longer needed, of his adoption of the Ultramontanism of the thirteenth, and the truculent Jesuitism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; recommending to his clergy the teachers of the obnoxious doctrines repudiated in the abjuration objected to; and so promptly following by his act the discussion in the Council of the Dublin Corporation, that it seemed as if designed to read a lesson and administer a rebuke to the self-elected Protestant champion of the politics of the Papacy, and to those others who, uniting with him in that discussion, exceeded their limits; meddling with things which it argued great presumption in them even to touch, and who ignorantly or officiously treating of the rights of the bishops of Rome, had in their zeal to take the foundation from under the obnoxious oaths denied or ignored the vitality of some of the most prominent powers claimed by the Sovereign Pontiff, as that of deposing sovereigns, that of conferring rights to kingdoms, that of absolving subjects from their allegiance to heretical princes, and of exercising supreme jurisdiction throughout the universe: against some of which assumptions those obnoxious oaths had been directed. In support of these observations we may add—the Papal delegate has given no doubtful interpretation, nor abstained from affording a patent test of his own views in the matter: making an occasion to express himself out of some remarks of the Archbishop of Dublin, a little before addressed to a public meeting, in reference to certain of the Irish in Galway who (he observed) "had been called out of populations, in the main Roman Catholic, to enjoy the light kindled in dark places." And to negative any such inference as that spiritual or religious darkness could exist where there were members of the Church of Rome, even in the wilds of Connaught, Dr. Cullen, in his next pastoral to his

clergy—that for the month of May, immediately following—essayed to demonstrate the absurdity of such an idea, and to claim the recognition of a noontide light, illumining his Church to the end of time; from having had within it, as members at some former period, certain individuals, so supereminent in theology, so illustrious, so deserving of admiration, so unquestionably orthodox, whose teaching and example infused an undying soul into Christianity for all future time; of such world-wide celebrity, stars of the first magnitude in the Roman Constellation, that only to name them should be all-sufficient to confound the Archbishop, to discomfit every gainsayer, convince every sceptic, and surround with a dazzling halo of religious light the church that claimed them as her own. In reading the names of those selected, we cannot but feel impressed with the idea that some fatuity controlled Dr. Cullen in the indiscretion of his choice, while we, at the same time, recognise in the theologians of the number, unmistakeable expositors of the Ultramontanism which is now being forced on the acceptance of Irish Catholics by the Jesuit Confraternity, through their associate the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin. In some respects the selection of Dr. Cullen is rather a curiosity in its way: among those he has named we do not find a single father or confessor of the early Christian Church, not a single pope, and there were some of those that did not entail contempt or odium on the Papal chair, as Sergius III. or as the profligate John XI., son of Sergius by the Roman harlot Marozia; all were not such monsters of wickedness as John XII., nor as Roderic Borgia (Alexander VI.), who also burthened the world with a son, Cæsar, another monster, his accomplice in wickedness, and only too like his sire to halt at any crime; all were not heretical, as Liberius, Felix, Celestin, or Honorius; nor simoniac and infidel, as Nicholas III., Boniface VIII., and Clement V.; many were of ordinarily good repute, as Gregory I. and IV., Agapetus, and others that might be named. Yet not one of those has Dr. Cullen appealed to, nor does a single ecclesiastic, whose life or writings have extenuated the errors of Romanism, shed a transient ray over the dark ages of Christendom, or reflected even a borrowed light of religion upon the Roman Church, appear in Dr. Cullen's *decade* of illustrious names, Bossuet and Fenelon excepted; the latter, no doubt, an amiable, eloquent, pious, and charitable man, admirable for his private character, his many virtues, and his unbounded benevolence; but ecclesiastically stigmatized as holding what, according to those who then ruled in the Church of Rome, was called heresy; accused and adjudged heterodox, and, through the enmity of a jealous rival, banished to his

distant See of Cambrai: Fenelon, whose "Maxims of the Saints" was condemned at Rome by Pope Innocent XII. as *heretical* because it savoured of mysticism. With this good, but somewhat visionary prelate, Dr. Cullen has placed, in ill-judged connection, Bossuet, his jealous rival and malignant persecutor; a man of unquestionable ability in some respects, but as a churchman bigoted, intolerant, and destitute of even the rudiments of Christianity, except in theory. Bossuet, who obtained from his patron, the dissolute, and scarcely less intolerant Louis XIV., the man of many mistresses, the order for Fenelon's exile. Bossuet, who accused Fenelon of heresy, and procured the condemnation of his book by the Pope. Bossuet, who, though credited with having drawn many to Popery by his "Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church," was unable to convert the Madame Guyon (Johanna Mary Bouvieres de la Mothe) from her religious enthusiasm, and failing in his effort, had that feeble woman, at an advanced age, committed to the Bastille; considering that where both his arguments and influence had failed, the horrors and miseries of a confinement in a wretched dungeon might, in the end, prove more prevailing. To these brilliant, orthodox (?), and least exceptionable of Dr. Cullen's theologians, he has added the name of Dante: one whose belief* was at variance with every principle of that papism Dr. Cullen would inculcate: Dante, whose mind was never fettered in ecclesiastical bondage; who scoffed at such priestcraft as Dr. Cullen would establish; who spurned the undue authority claimed by the arrogant Roman Pontiffs of his own time: Dante, the unflinching, caustic, merciless castigator of impious popes, who assigned to his contemporary Pope Boniface VIII.—

> "That haughty prince of modern Pharisees,
> Who, near the Vatican, his warfare waged,
> And not 'gainst Moors or Jewish enemies;
> For all were Christians whom his vengeful hand
> Oppressed."

* Dante wrote—"The Old and New Testaments are before the Church whose authority depends upon them, not on traditions which, after all, are dependent upon the Church.—*De Monarchia*, B. iii. p. 136. Priests should not have care of temporal matters.—*Idem.* Imperial Majesty and authority is the highest in human society.—*Convito Trat* iv. B. 4 Temporal authority is independent of spiritual authority—the power of the keys is limited—*De Mon.* B. iii. pp. 146, 198; and most notable of all "the Church is built upon Christ (not upon Peter) thus: other foundation can no man lay beside that which is laid, who is Christ Jesus; he is the rock ("Petra," the Peter) upon which the Church is built. *Fundamentum aliud, nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, qui est Christus Jesus. Ipse est* PETRA *super quam ædificata Ecclesia.*—De Mon. B. iii p. 173." Dante, in the same (De Monarchia), speaking of the Pope of his day, and his predecessors, denounces their ambi-

the *locus in Inferno*,* for which, by his crimes while on earth, he had qualified himself, following Nicholas III., his predecessor, by a short interval, to the fiery region where the poet has depicted simoniacal Popes, planted in holes, heads downwards, saying of them—

> "Without each hole a sinner's feet protruded;
> His legs, too, did the aperture reveal
> Far as the calves; the rest from sight excluded:
> The soles of every one in flames were wrapt."

Boniface himself to be followed by another simoniacal Pope living while Dante was writing, but of whom he pens the prediction that him—

> "From his holy office soon shall God
> Expel, and drive him down to that foul place,
> Where Simon Magus hath his cursed abode,
> To depth profounder thrusting Boniface."

With Dante, Dr. Cullen has joined as an exponent of the permanent orthodoxy of his church, the demented, love-sick Tasso, the puling admirer of Leonora, erratic at all times, violent on some occasions, confined in a convent for his reformation, and for seven years a lunatic prisoner in the hospital of Santa Anna; from which of these circumstances of his life Tasso established a claim to such a position among the luminaries of the Romish Church as Dr. Cullen has assigned him, we feel ourselves quite incompetent to determine; "the faithful must decide." These, with the artists, Raffaello and Michael Angelo, constitute six of the Archbishops *decade:* it is true they stand the lowest on the list, from which, perhaps, we should infer that they are the least important, and give our attention to those named first in order, as being entitled to the more prominent position and consideration. Doing so we shall presently see how much better they help the credit of the cause Dr. Cullen had in hand. The passage from his pastoral† reads thus:—"Of course, the learned dignitary (the Archbishop of Dublin, referred to in another part of the same pastoral, as the foreign mitred prelate sent to enjoy the confiscated revenues of the church in Dublin) will scarcely expect us to admit that the church of *Thomas Aquinas*,

tion and claims to temporal supremacy, their avarice, pride, and other vices, and denominates them "Children of iniquity and of the devil, however they may style themselves sons of the Church." Dr. Cullen has forgotten his usual caution in making his boast of Dante.

* The post-mortem condition of impious Popes of his own time is pourtrayed by Dante, especially in CC. xvii. and xxvii. of his Inferno.

† Pastoral of the Most Rev. P. Cullen, D.D., R. C. Archbishop of Dublin, for the month of Mary (May), 1865.

and *St. Bonaventura*, and *Bellarmin*, and *Suarez*, and Bossuet, and Fenelon, as well as of Dante, and Tasso, and Raffaello, and Michael Angelo, was a land of darkness and idolatry."

Having thus defined by name those whom, before all others, he selects as exemplars and exponents of the religious light within his church, no apology is needed on our part for going back to the periods and to the writers on which Dr. Cullen has thought fit to take his stand. He has opened an old page, and one that he should rather wish to be forgotten in the history of his church. That page, as he has now placed it before us, we shall do our best to interpret; and if any fault is to be found with us, it will be, because we have done so too fully and too faithfully, to please Dr. Cullen and his fellow-laborers of the "Society of Jesus." Dr. Cullen makes his boast of Aquinas, and Bellarmin, and Suarez; be it so: we would not needlessly have adverted to these men and their impious tenets, to revive the memory of them now, had they been allowed to remain in the profound infamy to which the civilized and Christian world had devoted them; but the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin having dragged them from the depth, to exhibit them in open day, we shall not be backward in exposing their doctrines, elucidating their theology! and exhibiting the character of that system the Romish hierarchy would now engraft upon the Catholic Church of Ireland. And in doing so we shall unveil, not what was the heavenly effulgence, but rather what was the lurid glare from Pandemonium, shed upon the so-called Christian world, through the perverted and Satanic minds of men whom Dr. Cullen is not ashamed to acknowledge, but, on the contrary, thinks it well to recall from the dead and from the ignominy to which, because of their impiety and immorality, they had been so long and deservedly consigned, and cause them to stand forward in the latter part of the nineteenth century as pillars of his church, standards of her illumination, and exemplars to her clergy.

How far Bossuet, and Fenelon, and Dante, and Tasso, and Raffaello, and Michael Angelo have during their lives shed such a lustre on the Church of Rome that its reflection should in the present day penetrate, according to Dr. Cullen, even to the wilds of Connemara, in Ireland, we need not delay to inquire: it would be a labour of mental microscopism to which we feel ourselves wholly incompetent. With what propriety *Aquinas*, and *Bonaventura*, and *Bellarmin*, and *Suarez* should now be commended by Dr. Cullen to the clergy of the Church of Rome in Ireland will better repay the effort to investigate it.

Entering upon such an inquiry, we instantly derive from AQUINAS

the embodiment of the presumption of Hildebrand, in the Ultramontane tenet on Papal Supremacy, hereinafter quoted. From him also is derived the infamous maxim acted upon by the Council of Constance, in delivering John Huss to the flames—"An intractable heretic ought to be delivered up (betrayed) to the judges (the secular power for punishment), any faith or oath pledged to the contrary notwithstanding."* But more of Aquinas presently. The next on Dr. Cullen's roll is BONAVENTURA—such is the name of the reputed author of that execrable travesty entitled "The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin," a production of so gross a nature† that many of those for whose use it was intended are ashamed of, and repudiate it. *Nicolle*, strongly as he contends for undue honors to the Mother of Jesus, does not attempt to defend or even excuse the vile and blasphemous production, simply observing—"The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin, which is circulated under the name of St. Bonaventura, is not, nor ever was, in public use in the Church."‡

Dr. Cullen's third luminary is BELLARMIN, a Cardinal and Jesuit, whose doctrines, referred to more fully hereinafter, on Papal Supremacy, on the right of exemption of the Bishops of Rome from any and every earthly jurisdiction, and of ecclesiastics of every degree from obedience to secular judges or tribunals, also on the Pope's power to change kingdoms, to take from one and give to another, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance to their Sovereign, form such a Catechism of Ultramontanism as have commended him, no doubt, to the Ultramontane Archbishop; to be recommended to his clergy, as the author of a rich treasury of instruction, suitable to the present time. A most decided testimony to the character of this man's teaching may be derived from the fact that his treatise on the temporal power of the Supreme Pontiff was formally and judicially condemned, almost immediately upon its publication in Catholic France, as so immoral, seditious, and pernicious a publication, that the penalties attached to the crime of high

* Hereticum indocilem prodendum esse judicibus, non obstante fide et juramento.—TH. AQUINAS.

† Bonaventura, however gross, may claim the negative commendation, that he did not in his Mariolatry attain the height of impiety and blasphemy of the Jesuit *Alan* in the following:—"Even though the entire Trinity had sworn by the wounds of Christ that it would never grant mercy to a sinner, MARY asking will obtain it—*Etsi tota Trinitas jurasset per vulnera Christi se nunquam misericordiam facturam peccatori, Maria impetrabit.*—ALAN DE RUPE.

‡ *Respondeo quod Psalterium B. Virginis quod sub S. Bonaventuræ nomine circumfertur in usu publico Ecclesiæ non est nec fuit unquam.*—NICOLLE. SYNOPSIS, p. 236.

treason were decreed against any one who should print, publish, or who would even retain a copy of it in his possession.

One more of Dr. Cullen's orthodox divines yet remains to be referred to, namely, the Jesuit SUAREZ, whom we shall permit to present the character of his doctrine in his own words, reading which, it will not be wondered at that the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, who approves of the theology and morality of Suarez, and of his theory on the Papal power, should feel displeased at the indiscretion of any one who, to proceed on his self-imposed knight-errantry in the cause of Popery, should disclaim or ignore the Sovereign Pontiff's right still to exercise those powers against which the so-called "obnoxious oaths" were directed.

SUAREZ writes—"A heretic king is straightway, because of heresy, *ipso facto* deprived; after sentence delivered (by the Pope) he is entirely deprived of his kingdom, so that he cannot hold it by any just title; therefore, from thenceforward, he may be altogether treated as a tyrant, and consequently may be slain by any person whatsoever." As we shall have occasion to quote Suarez in connection with different Ultramontane maxims, it will be unnecessary here to add more than that his book "*Defensio fidei Catholicæ*" (of which the foregoing is an extract), so highly valued by the members of his Order, and the Roman Hierarchy, like that of Bellarmin, was condemned by the Parliament of Paris, and ordered to be burned by the hands of the common executioner, as containing scandalous and wicked maxims, leading to the overthrow of States, to the influencing of subjects to lay violent hands on the persons of Kings and Princes, and to the undermining of the power of the Chief Magistrate. Such are the men whom Dr. Cullen especially commends—men whose baneful, seditious, and regicidal doctrines were the cause of Catholic France expelling their Order on different occasions from the kingdom, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century enjoining upon all within her dominion, before entering upon any office in the same, oaths of allegiance and abjuration similar to those in force, until recently, in Great Britain.

We shall now proceed in a more systematic manner to exhibit, by extracts from the writings of those men and their associates, Ultramontanism in a few of its most marked features.

On the merely religious opinions of Ultramontanists we do not purpose to make any comment; but limit our observations to the most prominent of their tenets, which cannot be maintained and propagated without socially or politically affecting others, as those in reference to

equivocation and mental reservation—the doctrine that no faith is to be kept with heretics—the doctrine of Papal supremacy in temporal matters, and of Pontifical authority to depose princes and absolve subjects from their allegiance, which at present seem principally to demand our notice. The first has been for a long time continuously acted upon, in the repeated pledges and declarations voluntarily tendered by the Romish hierarchy, when, in seeking increased political power, they, in the most solemn manner, abjured any intention of afterwards "attempting to unsettle the existing constitutions of the State," declaring that "they will not exercise the privileges sought, if conceded to them, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government of the country"—pledges afterwards treated by them as so many idle promises which they held themselves free at any time to disregard; their subsequent bearing in the matter exemplifying their belief that no faith need be kept with heretics beyond what was necessary for expediency and temporizing. The doctrine of Papal supremacy, as held and of late persistently proclaimed by Ultramontanists, involves a belief in Papal authority to depose princes—even that most foul doctrine of regicide is founded on the assumed omnipotence of the Sovereign Pontiff; and we may not pass it over unnoticed, nor permit it to be cast back to us, as so antiquated or obsolete that it is unnecessary now to dwell upon it, seeing that the present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin has thought fit publicly to commend Suarez, the Jesuit vindicator of the right of any private person to slay a sovereign denounced by the Head of his Church, which doctrine has been fully approved and subscribed by learned divines of the Jesuit order.

It would be inexpedient, and perhaps dangerous even, for ecclesiastics to inculcate in studied and elaborate treatises such tenets now as were formerly maintained by the Jesuits Mariana, Suarez, and Bellarmin. Indirectly however, and without any danger, they may be very effectively insinuated, through such a method as Dr. Cullen adopts—that of eulogizing those who taught and promulgated them; but how far short practically do men stop of the direct inculcation of principles similar to theirs, who first excite their followers to discontent and disaffection towards their government, and then hesitate not to encourage those of them that engage in a treasonable conspiracy against their Sovereign, sanctioning their public and ostentatious breach and defiance of the laws of their country, aiding them in their various plans for bringing the administration of justice into disfavour and contempt,

enlisting popular sympathy on the side of rebels, extenuating and excusing their criminality, and conferring honors, through the most solemn ceremonies of their Church, upon felons; whom, having suffered the penalty of capital punishment for murder committed in aid of a treasonable conspiracy to overthrow British government in Ireland, they hold forth to the Irish people as victims to the perpetuation of English misrule and tyranny, and "martyrs to their faith."

As fomenters of sedition and disturbers of states the Ultramontane Jesuits have long acquired notoriety; with them, conspirators against commonwealths have, in innumerable instances, been identified; and regicides of princes, not subservient to the Papacy, have ever possessed peculiar claims to their crown of martyrdom. Thus, to cite a few instances. The monk *Clement* who assassinated Henry III. of France, and *Guignard* his preceptor in the Jesuit's College at Paris, were placed by them upon their roll of martyrs. *Garnet*, the Jesuit Provincial of England, an accomplice of the conspirators in the Gunpowder Plot to destroy James I., being executed for the crime (which he confessed), and which his apologist, the Jesuit *Eudæmono-Johannes* (*Heureux*), unlike some ingenious modern writers, acknowledges he was privy to, was likewise honoured by his Order with a similar distinction: also *Castell* (pupil of the priest John Gueret, another member of the same Jesuit College of Claremont), who attempted to assassinate Henry IV., and *Ravaillac*, who afterwards assassinated that King, have both been placed upon the same record. The confession of *Peter Barriere*, another regicide, who contemplated the assassination of Henry, is interesting, but too long to introduce here. However, we extract from it that he finally consulted *Ambrosius Varadæus*, rector of the Jesuit College, who persuaded him that he could not do a work of greater merit; that if he should be slain in the act, "angels would bear him to Paradise, and that he would on account of it win a martyr's crown in Heaven." *Ipsum angeli in Paradisum exportarent, se eam ob causam martyrii coronam in cælo consecuturum.* We might, if desirable, add considerably to the number; but shall only refer to one other of the same class, lately brought under public notice in a way that some might conceive to be indicative of the Ultramontane-Jesuit animus of the present time, and therefore excusing, if not demanding, a passing notice.

On the 18th December, 1867, at a numerous meeting of the Irish R. C. Bishops and clergy, held in their Cathedral Church, Marlborough-street, on the subject of Education, presided over by Cardinal Cullen,

a Monsignor Moran, in his address, represented Trinity College, Dublin, as founded in 1592, to propagate heresy in Ireland, "in which (T. C.) all liberal arts were to be taught solely by heretical teachers," but as such heretical masters could not be found in Ireland, "it was resolved to send over some ministers remarkable in England and Scotland for their ability and eloquence. . . . . The persecuted Church of Ireland, however (he continued), was nobly avenged of its assailants, the learned Scotch and English preachers returned home with empty hands declaring that the harvest was not yet ripe. *Of one in particular* we know that he was so struck with the fervent piety and devoted attachment of the people to the Catholic faith that he *renounced heresy*, and soon after had the privilege of laying down his life for the faith at Tyburn—*this was the illustrious Jesuit martyr father* CAMPION." Campion was executed in 1581 : how he could have been among the heretical teachers sent over to assist in corrupting youth in Trinity College, not founded until more than ten years after his execution, passes our comprehension. It is not, however, to direct attention to Monsignor Moran's perversion of facts and disregard of dates, when disposed to invent a little episode to interest an audience, that we refer to his extraordinary statement, but to assert most decidedly and unhesitatingly that Campion never had any occasion to renounce the heresy, of which Monsignor Moran's mode of expression would imply that he had been guilty; for throughout his public life he had been nought else than a crafty Jesuit, hard to lay hold of, and expert at assuming false characters to escape recognition, while promoting the nefarious objects of his Order, and the service of his sovereign lord the Pope. In his Epistle to the General of the Jesuit Society he acknowledged his true character and deportment, saying—"In England he oftentimes changed his names and appeared in the most strange garb (In Anglia sœpe se commutare nomina et habitu dementissimo esse); and again in his *Epistola de persecutione Anglicana*, he says, "Jesuits do not tell their names correctly, but use false names and a deceptive dress" (*Jesuitas nomina non recte profiteri sed mentitis nominibus mentitaque veste uti)* in order to escape detection; but Monsignor Moran described Campion not only as a convert to Romanism, from which he never departed, but also as an illustrious Jesuit martyr. We have already noticed the late commendation of the Jesuit justifier of regicide by Dr. Cullen; we have referred to the regicides Clement, Garnet, Castell, Barriere, and Ravaillac as wearing the Jesuits' crown of martyrdom—being regarded as laying down their lives "for the faith" in the deaths they suffered, *because of their undertaking the destruction*

of heretical princes; and we come now to inquire in what consisted Campion's claim to a like honor. We have not far to look for it—this wily Jesuit who, by his protean changes of name, appearance, garb, and profession, was enabled to pass unrecognised from place to place, made his first step towards the distinction by coming over to England, the year before his career was brought to a close, under pretence of moderating the opinion of those who thought themselves bound to withdraw their allegiance from their sovereign, and carry things to extremities because of Her excommunication by the Pope, but in reality in order to do what in him lay to promote the operation of the Bull of Pope Pius V., by which Elizabeth was eliminated from the Church, and deprived of her kingdom, while those who aided her were consigned to execration. Endeavouring with his associates to stir up the people against their sovereign, he next entered into a conspiracy for the assassination of Elizabeth, which being divulged by some of his accomplices, he was apprehended, brought to trial, found guilty of the crime, and, as a traitor, ignominiously executed.* Thus have we, in a few words, the Title distinctly made out, as in the case of Garnet, whereby the Jesuit priest and regicide became, with Monsignor Moran and the members of his Order, "the illustrious Jesuit martyr father CAMPION, who had the privilege of laying down his life *for the faith* at Tyburn."

With some it will be a question: for what purpose, or with what object was it, that at a time when rumour had it that an outrage on our present Queen might be apprehended, one of those men, who call themselves the spiritual leaders of the Irish people, should present the Jesuit traitor Campion, executed for plotting the assassination of a former Queen of England, as winning thereby a martyr's crown? who could divine the motive of the speaker, or say, was it thus intended to direct the eyes of some fanatic to the fact that he, too, might entitle himself to the Jesuit's crown of martyrdom?—capable of being so easily, yet so infamously, purchased; if whatever his sovereign Pontiff demands, or his bishops and priests require, be not fully and speedily conceded by our present sovereign Queen Victoria. Monsignor Moran may disclaim such an intention; but one thing is certain—his act was a deliberate honoring of a regicide—one who was deservedly executed as a conspirator against the life of his sovereign for adhering to Protestantism, and rejecting the undue authority and pre-eminence insolently arrogated by a bishop of Rome within her kingdom; which

* See THUANUS, lib. 74.

thing being done in the presence of Cardinal Cullen and the Romish bishops and priests then assembled, and with their expressed approbation of the speaker's observations in the last month of the year 1867, who will venture to assert that *Regicide* was regarded by those addressed as infamous? that Jesuitism has in the slightest changed in spirit within the past three centuries? or that we should not place in the hands of those who shall read these pages what Jesuits have written and taught upon the subject: their doctrines being thoroughly interwoven into that Ultramontanism now being propagated, which is intimately related to, and endeavouring to operate by means of, the seditious and revolutionary movements by which Ireland has been for some time disturbed.

The present action of the Romish hierarchy takes the form of a retrogressive movement to mediæval Popery: to that must we look for its character; and in treating of the subjects we have selected from among others of less social or political importance, for the exemplification of that Popery, or Ultramontane Jesuitism, which is now being so assiduously disseminated, we shall adopt the simple method of stating the "tenet" in the form of a "Maxim," and then adducing the proofs by which it appears to be sustained; and first on the subject of

EQUIVOCATION AND MENTAL RESERVATION.

MAXIM—It is free and permissible to clerics and ecclesiastics, when they are examined by heretical magistrates, to use deceptions or equivocations; and also to use fictitious names and habiliments, and to suppress the truth, that they may the more conveniently insinuate themselves everywhere, and promote their undertakings.

In the transactions of the conspiracy of the Gunpowder Plot, in which the Jesuit Provincial, Henry Garnet, was concerned, he (as the Jesuit Campion when contriving the assassination of Elizabeth) and his associates, Oswald Tesmond, John Gerard, and Joseph Cresswell, used fictitious names, as practised by criminals of every class to escape detection; and thus the authors of the most vile and truculent publications have in many instances lain undiscovered: not always, however, have they so escaped identification. Jacob Keller, for instance, Jesuit of Ratisbon, in his philippic against anonymous publishing, subscribed himself falsely Jacobus Sylvanus, and his associate, Conrad

VETTER, assumed the name CONRADUS ANDRÆA; the CARDINAL BELLARMIN also adopted the same practice. In like manner, CAROLUS SCRIBANIUS, rector of the Jesuits in Antwerp, and author of the infamous book *Amphitheatrum honoris*, in which regicide is commended, concealed himself by a transposition of the letters of his name as CLARUS BONARSCIUS. Many similar assumptions of false names by Jesuits might be noticed if desirable.

MARTINUS NAVARRUS, whose doctrine Gregory XIII. affirmed to be "immoveable and holy," wrote a complete treatise on equivocation in honour of the most illustrious Society of Jesuits, wherein he calls this art of lying "the good and useful art of feigning and dissembling," designating it also "prudence" and "virtue," and says, "those who use this excellent prudence are to be commended." *Qui bona hac prudentia utuntur, laudandos esse.* GREGORY *de Valentia*, Jesuit, calls equivocation "a prudent defence."

HENRY GARNET, Jesuit, Provincial of England, denied that his Order inculcated the practice of equivocation, but the contrary appearing on his trial, and his acts running counter to his defence of his Order, he was told by the Attorney-General of England:—"It is true, indeed, they take heed, where it is apparent, to condemn lying and perjury; if they did otherwise, their wickedness would be exposed in the noon day, and they would be detested by all; but what they condemn are open, manifest, gaping lies and perjuries; false testimonies, which are especially detestable, and have neither a defence nor a precedent, they appear to approve of; but if they do not altogether approve of them in others, among themselves and those like to them, and the accomplices of their conspiracies, they approve and defend them, especially when it may be of use, and an assistance to them toward accomplishing their enterprizes." Garnet, under examination, at first denied that he had knowledge of any gunpowder plot, or that prayers were offered by the Jesuit priests for its success: afterwards convicted of falsehood by the examination of his accomplices, he replied, "They, indeed, had offered prayers for the prosperous issue of the great undertaking; that, however, had been done, understanding that then more severe laws were to be apprehended." Again interrogated whether he had not resorted to Oldcorn, and admonished to speak the truth without equivocation, he answered that he had not been with him, repeating it with imprecations on himself if he were not speaking the truth. Afterwards, when Hall, otherwise Oldcorn, his accomplice, confessed the contrary, Garnet acknowledged it was so, that he had been with him, but that "the

principles of the art of equivocation justified him in denying it until it had been proved against him." He also equivocated when asked what he thought of the excommunication of the King, saying, "King James has not been excommunicated as yet," which he could do on the Jesuit principles of equivocation (hereinafter appearing), by mentally holding it was James Stuart, not King James (*Jacobus Stuart, non Jacobus Rex*) that had been excommunicated, and so Jesuits, if some of their associates or disciples are accused of instigating to regicide, or of having slain kings or princes, deny that they did either, because it is not as kings or princes—which they believe them no longer to be after sentence by the supreme Pontiff—but under the designation of *heretics* or *tyrants* they have been slain. They consider that kingly title and authority cease in the man who is adjudged a heretic or a tyrant, according to their maxim: *Non in eodem subjecto esse posse regnum heresin et tyrannidem.*

Bellarmin used the like art of equivocation when he denied that Pope Sixtus V. commanded to kill the King (Henry), saying, "Popes do not command to kill *kings*"—(but they do command to destroy *tyrants*, the designation attached to Henry by the Jesuits when plotting his destruction).

MAXIM—It is lawful not only to equivocate to the interrogations of private persons, but even of Catholic Magistrates, and to deceive the interrogators, and that no less under an oath than without one, when forsooth the person interrogated does not regard the interrogator as his competent magistrate or judge; or if the interrogated should think that though a competent judge, he has not legitimate grounds for interrogating, or his opponent has not a just cause of litigation.

The Jesuit Jacobus Sylvanus (Jacob Keller), in his "*Philippic*," says, "It is lawful to use equivocation when he who interrogates is not a superior or judge. Am I obliged to give an answer in accordance with my own mind to every rustic or driver of a dung-cart asking it? who made me a debtor to everybody?

Martinus Navarrus, Jesuit, in his treatise *De Æquivocationibus*, says, by this doctrine of equivocation innumerable lies and faults may be avoided; if an answer is always given subtlely with some secret

understanding, as if we should be asked—Whither are you going? How much money have you? Have you borrowed? Have you given? What have you written? What has this one or the other said to you? To all of which we can answer without a fault—*by secretly understanding something*, as if any one should answer to some one asking money—a pound for instance—"I have it not" (although he may have it), secretly understanding I have it not *in such a way that I am bound to tell—to give—to show you*; or any addition of this kind." He gives an example in the case of a certain monk, Francis, who being interrogated by officers of justice pursuing a murderer, whether such a murderer had passed there (where Francis was), drawing his hands within his sleeves, Francis answered "he has not passed *here*," secretly understanding it in this way, which was the truth, though different from what they thought him to mean, "he has not passed here, *through these sleeves*."

An accused person (Navarrus writes) interrogated of a crime by a judge not proceeding juridically, is not bound to confess the truth, but may use equivocation, secretly understanding some other thing than the words signify, and adds, he who is answering a judge or superior, either without or under an oath, may use amphibology, or a mode of expression susceptible of two different interpretations, whether that is attainable out of different significations of the same word or of a different "*intention*" (*meaning*) of the interrogator and respondent, and although it may be false according to the "*intention*" of the interrogator; also, even to a magistrate or judge injuriously interrogating or adjuring, no one is bound to answer, according to his (the magistrate's or judge's) "*intention*." In such a case Navarrus instructs the person interrogated to say "*nescio*," I know nothing, secretly understanding within himself, "I know nothing *that I am bound to tell*." In the same way he instructs litigants, who are required to take an oath concerning matters in dispute, that if they are not regularly or justly required by the judge, they may deny or affirm according to their private "*intention*," not caring what may be the "*intention*" of the judge—thus, N. N. privately, or in the absence of witnesses, said to a certain female, "I accept you as my wife," but without any purpose of marrying her; afterward to the judge solemnly swearing him, and interrogating whether he had said these words, he answered "he had not said them," understanding within himself that he had not said them *with the intention of marrying her*; and Navarrus adds, "This was not a lie, but a prudent and honest equivocation."—*Hoc non esse mendacium: sed æquivocationem prudentem et honestam.*

FRANCISCUS TOLETUS, Cardinal and Jesuit, writes :—*De Instruct, Sacerd* l. 4, c. 21—"If any person being sworn is interrogated by a "superior, then if he be *justly* interrogated he is bound to answer without equivocation ; but if unjustly, he may use equivocation and answer, "not according to the mind of the judge, but according to his own "mind ; and if the crime is entirely hidden from sight concerning "which any one is interrogated, then he can use equivocation, answering '*Nescio*,' I know nothing ; understanding, however, within himself, I know nothing *that I should tell you*, or by answering *Non feci*, "I did not do it, understanding within himself, I did not do it *just* "*now*, I did not do it *yesterday*, or anything similar. It being a "matter of indifference though he be interrogated on oath : also to a "judge inquiring—'Have you done that?' He may answer, 'I have "'not,' understanding within himself, *that I should tell you*, or I have "not done it that I should tell you *now*, or anything similar to this ; "and if a man should inquire of his wife—Are you an adulteress ? "she can say I am not (although it may be true that she is), by understanding within herself, I am not, *that I should disclose it to you* ; so "he who is compelled to swear that he will take another to wife by "understanding inwardly *if hereafter it should please him ;* and any "one taken by robbers may swear that he will hereafter give them a "hundred pieces of gold that he may be released, and swearing equivocally, saying within himself if "hereafter," meaning on some subsequent occasion, he should be released, then he is not bound to pay ; "another interrogated and bound on oath to tell the truth whether he "saw such a one to-day ? by this 'art of equivocation' may plainly "deny it, even though knowing he had seen him, having reserved this "meaning of his answer within himself, thus—I did not see him *that* "*I should tell it to the magistrate*, or I did not see him *in beatific* "*vision*, or I did not see him *at Venice*."

The same is taught by ANDREAS EUDŒMONO JOHANNES (JOHANNES HEUREUX) *in Anticotoni Confutatione*, who says, "when any one through unfair process is brought to justice, because no one is bound to betray himself to the magistrate, he may openly, fairly, and without any flinching, deny that of which he is accused, because always that little clause is secretly understood—*ita ut tenear dicere* : "I did not do it (*so that I am bound to tell*)."

Not to multiply examples of Jesuit teaching on this subject, we shall refer to but one more, that of GREGORIUS *de* VALENTIA, *de Reo*. Tom. 3, Disp. 5, q. 13. "Whensoever," he says, "a disadvantageous inter-

rogation is made, even though an oath may be attached to it; nevertheless, no perjury is committed if one should affirm on oath anything which is true, *though in a sense that is foreign to the interrogation.* Such a person does not lie, nor use the name of God vainly; since he does it, *looking to himself or to his own meaning.*

PAPAL SUPREMACY.

MAXIM—The Roman Pontiff possesses entire spiritual and temporal power of every kind; the right of commanding and of prohibiting; the right of the ban, or excommunication; the right, moreover, of punishments; the right of the choice and delegation of imperial authority; the right of instituting and deposing all kinds of civil governors, even those who are emperors, kings, and princes, as well as those of every other rank whatsoever, and their deputies, and these are to be held as articles of faith: verily, he who does not approve, or does not believe this, is to be regarded as a detestable heretic.

Although the Popes Gregory II., Nicholas I., John VIII., Formosus, Stephen VI., and Leo IX. have been by different writers referred to as attempting something approaching to the exercise of a supremacy over temporal powers, satisfactory evidence is wanting of any definite assumption of such an authority earlier than the latter part of the eleventh century, when Hildebrand (Gregory VII.), attaining to the See of Rome, laid claim to supreme temporal power, as his by Divine right, as "Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom all power was committed in heaven and in earth," declaring those to be excommunicated who would question his claim, or would not submit to his assumed authority, and proclaiming—"We, holding the statutes of our holy predecessors, do, by Apostolic authority, absolve those from their oath of allegiance who are bound by fealty or oath to excommunicated persons, and in every way forbid that they should maintain allegiance to them. *Greg. vii., Ep. viii.*, 21, *caus. xv., q.* 7, *c.* 4.

We can find nothing on reliable authority which should attach any doubt to the statement of the Church of Liege, that "Pope

Hildebrand is the author of this novel schism, and first raised his sacerdotal lance against the kingly crown." *Hildebrandus P. auctor est hujus, novelli Schismatis et primus levavit Sacerdotalem lanceam contra diadema regni.* Eccl. Leod., apud. Bin., tom. vii.

PLATINA in his life of Gregory VII. relates these words of his to the Council: "Bestir yourselves, ye princes of the Apostles, and confirm by your authority what I have said; that all may now at length understand that we can confer, and we can take away, Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, and whatsoever mortals can possess."*

AQUINAS, the first of the illustrious *Decade* of his church, referred to by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, upholds the supremacy claimed by Hildebrand. The sum of his doctrine on this subject is contained in the following sentences, which need not to be enlarged upon:—

"To be subject to the Roman Pontiff is necessary to salvation."

"In the Pope is the supremacy of both powers" (temporal and spiritual).

"The Sovereign Pontiff has, by Divine law, spiritual and temporal power, as Supreme King of the whole world."†

After Hildebrand, Innocent III., the sanguinary and ruthless exterminator of the Albigenses, greatly extended the Papal aggression on temporal powers; and after him Gregory XI., and Innocent IV., assumed like authority, which has been claimed by their successors to the present day, though the ability to enforce it has long ceased to exist.

In the latter part of the thirteenth century, BONIFACE VIII., according to Binius—"a man above measure ambitious and arrogant"‡—proclaimed himself "King of kings, monarch of the world, sole ruler in temporals and spirituals." *Regem se regum mundi monarcham, unicum in Spiritualibus et temporalibus dominum.*

In *Unam Sanctam Extravag., lib. I., tit.* 8, *c. I., de Majoritate et Obedientia*, BONIFACE thus wrote and decreed:—Both, therefore, are in the power of the church, the spiritual and the material sword; but this, indeed (the material sword), is to be exercised for the church; that (the spiritual sword) by the church; that by the hand of the

* *Agite Apostolorum Principes, et vestra auctoritate quod dixi confirmate: ut omnes nunc demum intelligant. Nos imperia regna principatus et quicquid habere mortales possunt, auferre et dare posse*—PLATINA *in Vita, Greg. VII.*

† *Subesse Romani Pontifici, sit de necessitate salutis—Thom. in Opusc, con. Grœcos—In Papam esse apicem utriusque potestatis.—Summum Pontificem jure divino habere, Spiritualem et temporalem, potestatem ut Supremum totius mundi regem—Thom. Lib. iii., de Regim Princ., c.* 10.

‡ *Vir Super modum ambitiosus et arrogans.* Bin. in Vit., Bonif. VIII.

priest; this by the hand of kings and armies, but at the direction *(nutum)* and sufferance of the priest. The spiritual power has it of right to institute earthly power, and to judge it, if it be not good; for so of the church and of Ecclesiastical power is that prophecy of Jeremias' to be verified. "Lo! I have appointed thee this day over nations and kingdoms, &c." Wherefore, if earthly power err, it is to be judged by spiritual power; but if a minor spiritual err, it is to be judged by its superior; but if the supreme spiritual err, it can be judged by God alone, and not by man; the apostle bearing witness—"The spiritual man judgeth all things, but is himself judged by no one." Boniface concludes—"We declare, assert, define, and pronounce that to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is necessary for every human creature to salvation."

The same claim to supremacy was maintained in the Florentine Synod, and expressed as follows:—"We declare that the Holy and Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff have sovereignty throughout the universe."

Baronius says—"There can be no doubt that civil principality is subject to sacerdotal (principality). God hath made the political world subject to the dominion of the spiritual church."—*Bar. Ann.* 57, ss. 23, 53.

"None dissent from this, unless he who cuts himself off from the Church."

"All are to be branded with the error of heresy who would take away from the Roman Pontiff either of the two swords, or concede to him only the spiritual sword."—*Bar. Ann.* 1053, s. 14.

So maintained the Jesuits Mosconius, Fr. Bozius, and Alex. Pesantius, and also Sylv. Prierias in *Epitome Respons, ad Lutherum.*

In the Jesuit compilation, entitled, *Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,* is expressed—"The supreme authority of the Pontiff is an article of faith. The Pope possesses the power of casting any prince out of his principality, and to such sentence, if promulgated, the subjects of princes ought to be obedient."

Bellarmin challenges those who consider that the Pope has not, as Pope, any temporal power by Divine law, and that he cannot command secular princes, much less deprive them of their kingdoms and sovereignty; and says "this is not so much a matter of opinion as a heresy."—*Bellar. de Rom. Pontif,* l. v., c. i., *et seq.*

Bellarmin also asserts it is the doctrine of Augustus, Triumphus, Alvarius, Pelagius, Panormitanus, Hostiensis, Silvester, and others,

that the Pope has the fullest power by Divine right throughout the whole world, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs.—*Idem.*

Aug. Triumphus, *in Potestat. Eccles.*, plainly expresses himself thus: "It is an error not to believe that the Roman Pontiff, the pastor of the universal church, the successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ, has universal pre-eminence over temporal and spiritual matters, into which many fall through ignorance of the said power, which, since it is infinite, every created intellect is found to fail in comprehending it."

Of the doctrine of the Jesuit *Mariana*, another upholder of the Papal supremacy in temporals, we abstain from saying anything in this place, as we shall find a necessity for referring to it hereafter in connection with that of *Bellarmin* and *Suarez* on the subject of regicide.

NO FAITH WITH HERETICS.

MAXIM.—The constitutions, compacts, capitulations, fraternizings, or concessions of emperors, kings, or princes, and of other orders, ought to be regarded as invalid and altogether nullities, in which any other religion than the Roman Catholic is tolerated, though confirmed by an oath, unless they have been approved of by the Roman Pontiff.

Aquinas laid the foundation for the above in his brief maxim, *Hereticum indocilem prodendum esse judicibus non obstante fide et juramento*, but "*The peace of religion*," which was established in Germany against the efforts of the Jesuits, called forth the fullest expression of their bitterest intolerance, of which we supply many examples in the pages following.

Jacobus Simancha, Bishop of Pacenza, *De Cathol. Institut.*, c. 46, n. 52, teaches:—"To the torment and hatred of these heretics it appertains that faith pledged to them is not to be kept, though confirmed by an oath." Again, "with heretics there should be no intercourse nor any peace, and therefore, faith pledged to them, although confirmed by an oath, is by no means to be observed." And, he adds, "oftentimes have we said this; it is necessary, however, that it should be

unceasingly reiterated, and that we should not be silent so long as that term 'peace' is spread before us for their protection."

Jesuits universally taught that "the peace of religion," as though it had been extorted from the emperor, was not binding; in short, that it was to be only a temporary concession, a delay, a stay, and tolerance forsooth, until something better could be accomplished.

So JOHANNES PAULUS VINDECK, *in Deliberat. de Hœresibus exstirpandis,* wrote:—"By this formula of peace, the emperor acted warily with Protestants, coerced by extreme necessity." Further, "to Protestants had been granted only a postponement, a delay, and tolerance, wherefore we wonder at the folly of sectaries who, in defending their religion, are wont so often most foolishly to babble the decrees of the Comitiæ against us: for if Catholics sometimes come to an agreement with sectaries, they do it to the end that, having brought other matters to a close in the meantime, they may afterwards direct their warfare against heretics alone, and turn all its force against them."

ANDREAS ERSTERNBERGER (Burckhardus), MELCHIOR CLESELIUS, and many others, teach the same.

MARTINUS BECANUS, of Mentz, Jesuit, in *Disputat de Fide Hereticis Servand,* asserts—"Liberty, or that Peace of Religion by which it is freely permitted to be a Catholic, or a Lutheran, or a Calvinist, is altogether unlawful and repugnant to divine precept, nor can it be otherwise tolerated than for some little time, for sake of avoiding greater detriment; verily," he adds, "this liberty should rather be obstructed and laid waste by Catholics, by all ways by which that may be conveniently done. Let all know that even should anything be obtained by them through a special rescript or covenant, it is of no authority."

Cardinal HOSIUS, in his epistle to Henry, King of Poland, exhorted him in no way to keep the faith he had pledged to the Evangelical Poles, saying—*Nunquam patiaris ulla te ratione ad ea quæ promisisti servanda teneri, quia juramentum non debet esse vinculum iniquitatis.*

MARTINUS BECANUS, Jesuit, before referred to, denied that Roman Catholics taught, or decreed in the Lateran Council under Julius II., and Leo. X., and in the Council of Trent, as well as in that of Constance, that faith was not to be kept with heretics.

On the other hand, JACOBUS SIMANCHA most definitely taught it in his treatise *De Cathol. Institut*: thus: *Fides illis data servanda non sit non obstante juramento,* adding—"If faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other robbers, who kill the body, is it to be kept with obstinate heretics, who kill the soul?" Again—"With

heretics there should be no commerce, no peace from Catholics, wherefore faith pledged to them, even confirmed by an oath, as being against the public good, against the salvation of souls, against divine and human laws, should by no means be kept." He cites, among other authorities for this, that of *Aquinas*, already quoted—"An intractable heretic should be betrayed to the judges, any faith or oath notwithstanding."

Molanus, l. 6, c. 27, expressly teaches—It is a general rule with Pontiffs that either faith is not to be pledged to heretics, or not to be kept, if pledged to them in reference to religion.

MAXIM.—If Pontiffs are constrained to fear their efforts might prove vain, or that a greater detriment would accrue to them, they may temporize and postpone their proceedings to a more promising time.

In the book *Memorabilia Ligæ*, tom. 6, Jesuits are said "to possess an Apostolic brief, in which, by dispensation, they are permitted to be subservient for a time, to be dissembling and obedient to the king (though a heretic), at the time for dissembling" (when dissimulation appears to be expedient or desirable).

So Petrus Ribadeneira, Jesuit, *de Principe*, lib. i. c. 26, says: "Christian prudence teaches to use dissimulation if great dangers are apprehended."

Martinus Becanus, *de Fide Hæretic. Servand*, c. 10, says: "If the Lutheran religion cannot advantageously be obstructed and wasted, unless with a greater loss, then it may be for a time tolerated. The Catholic magistrate ought to obstruct the liberty of the Lutheran religion by all means; if, however, that cannot be done without a more grievous inconvenience, he may tolerate it in order to escape the greater evil."

Vindeck, in *Deliberat de Hæresib exstirp*, writes: "It behoves us to connive at nothing, to concede nothing in matters of religion, unless where the liberty is promoted by public authority, and men of high standing and influence."

Thus, the Jesuit Provincial, Henry Garnet, testified in his writings, and confessed in his examination, that the Popes Pius V. and Gregory XIV., being advised that their Bulls against Queen Elizabeth would cause great disasters to the Pontiffs, smoothed them down by conceding that all Catholics might make a display for themselves of external obedience to buy off trouble, circumscribed, however, by these

clauses and limitations: *Firstly*, that affairs are in such a position as to need it. *Secondly*, that it is only to continue until public execution of the Bull can be accomplished.

The Jesuit COSTER, in the last chapter of his *Sica Tragica*, boasts of the crafty wisdom of himself and his society thus: *Ita nôrunt vela obliquare in ventos*, &c. They so knew how to trim their sails to the winds, that from whatever side a propitious blast may blow, they catch it, whether it be an east wind or a zephyr.

ALEX. HAYES, Jesuit, often publicly taught, "When there is occasion for it, the contrary is to be externally feigned to that which internally you feel in your heart; and so, according to the present occasion, you should feign as if it were your desire to obey the King." (Henry IV., assassinated almost immediately after by the Jesuit regicide *Ravaillac*).

EXTERMINATION OF HERETICS.

MAXIM.—It is to be an object of unceasing labour to Pontiffs everywhere, to crush down by fire, by sword, by poison, by gunpowder *(pulvere tormentario)*, by warfare and other machinations, heretics, and those who foster them (those political Catholics who would rather preserve peace than lend their assistance to the bearing down of heretics), unless, perchance, that Pontiffs should fear that their attempt might prove vain, and that some detriment would thereout arise to the Catholic religion, in which case something should be conceded to the circumstances of the time, and a more seasonable opportunity awaited for.

The proceedings of HENRY GARNET, Jesuit Provincial of England, are a commentary on the above text. The Jesuits, RIBADENEIRA, *de Principe*, lib. i. cc. 18 & 26; PAULUS CHIRLANDUS, *De Hæreticis*, q. 3, n. 2; SIMANCHA, *Instititut. Cathol.*, c. 46, have all written fully in support of the above maxim; Cardinal REGINALD POLE, also in *Orat. ad Carol* v. *Imp.*, persuades the Emperor:—"The Turkish war being relinquished for the present, war should be set in motion against heretics, for these being disposed of, you could then attack and despatch the others (Turks) with less trouble. From a Turk less danger

threatens (than from a heretic)." An oration full of the same sentiments was addressed to the Emperor Maximilian II. during the Augustan Cimitiæ, containing the following truculent passage:—"*Quamdiu non equum tuum in Lutheranorum sanguine ventre tenus natare feceris.*" "How long time ago might you not have made your horse to swim up to its belly in the blood of Lutherans; you ought to regard as of less account what you might obtain by good fortune or victory against the Turk."

Conradus Brunus, Jesuit, in lib. 3 *De Hæret*, expresses very similar sentiments; and the Jesuit Vindeck, *De Exstirp Hæres Antidoto* 10 & 11, prescribes, what, lest our translation might be supposed to be in anywise strained, we give in his own words:—"*Lutheranos mortis supplicio exterminandos, interficiendos, propulsandos, reprimendos, delendos, ustionibus et sectionibus, excindendos, tollendos, explodendos, viriliter exstirpandos, trucidandos, internecione delendos.*"—"Lutherans are to be exterminated by executions, to be slain, to be driven out, to be kept under, to be destroyed, to be cut off by fire and sword, to be made away with, to be blown up, to be emasculated, to be assassinated, to be blotted out by massacre."

In Petrus Steuartius *Contra Hasenmullerum* is written, when lighter penalties prevail not with heretics, but the poison spreads wider, resort is to be had to fire and sword. Christopherus Rosenbusch professes, in *Replica sua*, that he heartily embraces this sentiment. Matthias Meyerhofer, in *Speculum Predicantium*, writes, that he and those like him (Jesuits) so agree in this opinion that "they hold it even as an Article of Faith."

Stapleton, Jesuit—*Oratione contra Politicos*—says: Such politicians (Roman Catholics who persuaded to peace rather than to sanguinary executions) are worse than Turks and heretics, because they refuse by arms and wars to propagate Catholicism—these even, as new Diagorases and Protagorases—ought to be expelled from every city as the Athenians expelled those ancients, a reward even being proposed for him who would slay them.

Baronius, Cardinal, in *Epistola ad Papam contra Venetos*, writes—Most Holy Father, the ministry of Peter is twofold: "to feed," and "to kill," according to that "Feed my Sheep" and according to that "Kill and eat." Wherefore it is the business of the Pontiff with refractories and opponents, as Peter was ordered, to sacrifice and slay them.

Johannes Paulus Vindeck counselled a league and alliance of Catholic Princes for the destruction of sectaries, adding—"Nor is the oppor-

tunity to be neglected, since, forsooth, Protestants are drained of money; and in order that Catholics may the more easily crush sectaries to the death, occasions should be laid hold of by various means and arts being brought to bear on them to disunite them." This sanguinary Jesuit boastfully proclaimed—"Know ye, know ye, heretics, that the methods of extirpating you are not wanting to us;" so also, the Jesuit CAMPION boasted against the English people in *Epistola ad Consiliaros Reginæ Angliæ*, thus: "What appertains to our society (Jesuit) I would have you to know. All we who are spread far and wide through the whole earth, of whom there is a continual succession, and a vast number, have entered into a holy league, that never, so long as even one of us remains, shall we cease our purpose and designs *in regard to your salvation* (subjection to the Papacy); long ago the design was commenced, and no force, no onset of the English shall outlive the begun contest."

The Jesuit CRESSWELL, writing as PHILOPATER, *contra Edictum Reginæ Angliæ*, adopts a similar strain. In like manner, the Jesuit HILLIUS, at Ratisbon, in the public Comitiæ harangued thus: "Now has the time come to mature the crushing by force and the extermination of these heretics. Catholics are not deficient either in nerve, money, military, or devices." And in a communication at the same time from the Bishops at Ratisbon to the Archduke of Austria, it was said—"There should be no more temporizing, but life, blood, and all our fortunes risked. All extremes should be tried, there should be no despondency, since even small handfuls of Catholics, as VINDECK says in *Delib. de Hœres exstirp*, have oftentimes massacred great numbers of heretics, and destroyed them by a universal slaughter." "*Cum et parvæ Catholicorum manus sæpe ingentes Hereticorum copias trucidaverint et internecione deleverint.*"

In a comparatively late publication, entitled "*Synopsis Var. Resol. ad usum Sacræ Theologiæ Candidatorum*," by the Very Rev. Father Fr. Vincent Nicolle, Ex-Provincial and Master of Theology of the Holy Order of Predicants, published by permission of his Eminence the Lord Cardinal Pipia, General of the entire Order of FF. Predicants, with the approbation of the Royal and Ordinary Professor of the Faith of Controversies, J. M. Arnaud, and with the approval of the Professors of Theology of the Order at Douai, the extermination of heretics is maintained and justified. In that Synopsis for the instruction of Divinity Students in the Church of Rome, reference is made to the Acts of the Fourth Lateran Council under the blood-thirsty Pope Innocent III., who found in those Dominicans willing agents to the extermination of the

Albigenses, and officials for his institution of the Inquisition; and their successors approve their doings. The passage is in the form of question and answer, as between a professor and his pupil, thus:—

Do you inquire whether by Canon 3 (of Lateran Council, 1215) the Church justly delivered the heretic Albigenses to the secular power to be punished with temporal punishments?

I answer yes.—I prove it—Because heretics deserve capital punishment, and especially the Albigenses, most wicked of all; wherefore secular powers can condemn them to capital punishment, and the Church can permit that, according to their office, they may execute sentence on those criminals whom she delivers to them to be sacrificed by the material sword.

I proved before—*First.* That blasphemy might be justly punished by death; therefore also heresy, which is a certain species of blasphemy. *Second.* Murderers who take away the life of the body are put to death; therefore *a fortiori* heretics who take away spiritual life may be put to death. *Third.* Robbers and debasers of money suffer capital punishment; wherefore heretics are justly punished capitally who adulterate the Word of God and corrupt the faith.

[S. *Thomas* (Aquinas) 2.2 Q. 10, 8, learnedly resolves the question.]

Do you inquire whether the war against the heretic Albigenses was just?

I answer yes.—I prove it—That is a just war when in him who wages the war there is legitimate authority, a just cause, and rectitude of intention; but the war against the Albigenses was directed by legitimate authority, for the most Christian King Philip Augustus undertook it. . . and proclaimed that war as Defender of the Catholic Faith, the Supreme Pontiff Innocent III. entreating him to do so. There was also a just cause, for it was done on account of the insult offered to God and the church, as well as to the mother of God and the saints; moreover there was rectitude of intention, namely, the amendment of heretics, the punishment of rebels, and the defence of religion and of the Church. *Ergo*, &c.

Heretics object, first—"The Church has not a right to draw the sword, whence Christ said to Peter, 'Return thy sword to its place.'—Matt. 26. But the war against the Albigenses was declared and carried on by authority of the Church, and the order of the Supreme Pontiff; wherefore that war was not just if the authority of him ordering it be regarded."

I answer—The Church has not the right to draw the sword, but it may be drawn by secular princes; war was waged not by the Church,* but for the Church, against heretic Albigenses, at the will, indeed, and entreaty of the Sovereign Pontiff, who granted indulgences to the crusading leaders and soldiers; but the sword was drawn against them by the order of the Most Christian King Philip Augustus. Bishops, priests, and monks did not fight in that war with the material sword, but with the sword of the Spirit—forsooth, with prayers, preachings, and advices.

Second Objection—War, in which the faithful, promiscuously with proved heretics, subjects with rebels, unarmed women with innocent children are slaughtered, is not just, but cruel; but that was done by the army of Crusaders in sacking the City of Beziers.

I answer—If the innocent are butchered either by the command or assent of the leaders, it *might* be so; if, however, it happens from the blind fury of the soldiers, that does not hinder it being a just war.

I have said "it *might* be so," because the citizens (he does not even except the innocent children) *deserved* this slaughter, who, when the Catholic leaders permitted and even urged them to depart from the city, or to deliver the heretics up into their hands; a conspiracy being formed (?), and joining themselves with heretic men; they decreed to hold the city against the Catholic army.

Neither Nicolle's argument nor morality will appear at all strange to those conversant with the principles of Jesuitism. It is on record that *Catesby*, the principal in the Gunpowder Plot, feeling some scruples on the subject, considering that by the explosion, along with heretics many Catholics of rank might also perish, betook himself to Henry Garnet, the Jesuit Provincial, for counsel, "Whether it would be lawful or not, in order that the bad should be taken away, that some even of the good should be destroyed with them?" to which Garnet answered that "Both might be taken off together with a safe conscience, provided only it should be done for the good and advancement of the Church."

* Jesuits evade the maxim, "*Qui facit per alium facit per se.*"

OF THE DEPOSITION OF PRINCES AND OF REGICIDE.

MAXIM.—Whensoever Catholic subjects have determined in their councils and convocations that their emperor, king, or prince is to be regarded as a *tyrant*, then they ought to depose him, and free themselves from every bond of obligation to him; but if they are prohibited from holding assemblies, then it is allowable for every subject to take council only of Jesuits, or other such theologians; verily it would be commendable and meritorious to slay such a king or prince.

Johannes Mariana, Jesuit, in *De Rege et Reg. Institut.*, lib. i., c. 6, writes:—"A king may be despoiled of his principality by his people or subjects willing it, and whoever assails tyrants, to destroy them, should, during the memory of man, be held in great renown. The most expeditious, and by far the safest way is, if permission for a public assemblage be granted, to determine by common consent what should be established and ratified; and if the prince should not obey warnings, but unfolding his designs, should procure arms, and command moneys for war against his subjects, that prince, being deprived of authority, may be slain by the sword. But if the licence for public assembling should be withdrawn, even then, he who, abetting the public wish, might try to destroy that king or prince, I shall by no means be of opinion that he has done wrongly; and unless the public voice of the people, which regards the king as a tyrant, assists, learned and grave men (*i.e.*, theologians of the Jesuit order) are to be referred to for advice." Mariana adds:—"Well, very well, would it be if many men could be found of courageous heart, and despisers of life and safety, for the liberty of their country." Further on he laments that "a desire of safety, oftentimes adverse to great enterprizes, restrains most persons," instancing, as an example to be followed, Ehud, who slew Eglon, King of the Moabites.

Cresswell, Jesuit, *Adversus Edict Reginæ Angl.*, writes:—"The royal power is of civil right; wherefore, on the decision of the people, according to their pleasure, any one is king or not king" (the sanction

of the Pontiff, as a matter of course, being necessary to the confirmation of the decision).

The book of the Jesuits, on the deposition of Henry III., King of France, published at Leyden by John Pillehot, by command of the superiors of the Jesuit order, teaches the same thing. In it Henry is accused of being "an impious and false tyrant;" to which is added—"It would be very rightly done if he, with those kings and princes who are like him, should be slain by some one or more of their many vassals or subjects, no special excommunication or mandate being awaited for; and those who would do such an act, through that very deed itself would attain to great glory and eternal life." "We should not" (say these Jesuits) "delay to seek aids and means whereby such a king, with all his adherents, might be overthrown and slain."

Such also were the books written by the Jesuit *Guignard*, seized under the order of the Parliament in the Jesuit's college of Claremont, consisting of a treatise and several theses in praise of the regicide James Clement, approving of the assassination of the King, demonstrating its lawfulness, and concluding that his successor should not be otherwise treated; in which might be read that "the cruel Nero was slain by Clement, and the hypocrite monk made away by the hand of the true monk;" that the heroic action perpetrated by James Clement had been justly praised as a gift of the Holy Spirit by the deceased prior of the Jacobites, *Burgoyne*, confessor and martyr; and as to his successor, "If he could not be deposed without war, war ought to be made against him; if war could not be made upon him, he should be privately made away with." *Guignard* was tried, confessed his guilt, and was executed. The Jesuit *Richeomus* has, notwithstanding *Guignard's* confession, to exculpate his Order endeavoured to excuse this Jesuit prompter to assassination, on the pretext that *Guignard* had employed these theses merely for disputations to see whether they could be theologically sustained; but *Guignard* speaking, and being, no doubt, the best interpreter of his own mind, expressed himself "grieved that in the Parisian massacre (St. Bartholomew's) such a mistake was made as that Henry, King of Navarre, had not been destroyed at the same time as the others."

Of the same tenor is the book of the Jesuit Reinald, *De justa Reipub Christianæ*, published under the fictitious name of William Rosse, and many others from a like source, the authors of which have concealed themselves under false names.

The same is taught in the book of Franciscus Veronæus, entitled,

Apologia pro Johanne Castello et Jesuitis, which, after their expulsion from France, the Jesuits published in Belgium; in it, from beginning to ending, he lauded and approved the project of their disciple, John Castell, to assassinate Henry IV. as heroic and just, as also the assassination of Henry III.; and affirmed that "Castell had been deservedly recorded in the number of martyrs."

Even after the assassination of Henry IV. had been attempted by Castell, when, in accordance with a decreet of the Parliament at Paris, all things in the college of the Jesuits at Claremont were diligently inquired into, the inquisitors ascertained that the Jesuit *John Gueret*, the preceptor of Castell in that college, taught his pupils this same thing publicly, and privately; on which account he was sentenced to perpetual exile: the Jesuit *Alex. Hayes* suffered a like penalty for a like offence.

MAXIM.—If subjects have a king or prince a Lutheran, or other heretic, who endeavours to lead them into heresy, then those subjects are free from all homage and obligation, and they are at liberty, and permitted to reject, exterminate, and destroy such a king or prince. Moreover, such princes may be destroyed, even by poison, either by their subjects or servants (*a subditis vel ministris suis*), in such manner, however, that he who is to be destroyed does in no way assist or procure death to himself.

It is on record in the acts of the Jesuit Henry Garnet, that in the twenty-sixth year of Elizabeth's reign *Parry* came to England, persuaded by Cardinal de Como to slay the Queen, as an outcast of the Church, and that this was allowable by the highest law. *Parry*, by way of atonement, or in mitigation of his crime, confessed before his execution that, while staying at Venice, he became acquainted with one Father *Benedict Palmius*, a Jesuit, who persuaded him "that it was lawful to take away from among the living all kings condemned by Papal anathema," which matter, when afterwards he consulted a certain monk, by name *Vatel*, he by no means approved of it, but said it was a false and damnable proposition.* Being in doubt of mind, and desirous of making his confession, he betook himself to a certain *Han-*

* Another proof of the vast distinction that exists between Catholics and Papists.

nibal Codretus, a Jesuit, at Paris, who affirmed that Vatel was a heretic; that he (*Parry*) could not do any action of greater merit, on account of which "angels would carry him into the rest of the saints."

The Jesuit ALAN,* in *Apologia Stanleianæ proditionis*, makes this defence:—"Since Elizabeth, Queen of England, was both a heretic and excommunicated, not only was it lawful for her subjects, but even they were bound to it by the obligation of conscience, to denude her of every shelter or defence which they could; and whatever armies, or towns, or citadels, or fortresses of hers they could possess themselves of, to deliver them to the Spanish king, so that the Queen should no longer have anything she could call her own."

FRANCISCUS SUAREZ, Jesuit, *Defensione Fidei Catholicæ*, lib. 6, c. 6, writes:—"A heretic king is instantly, because of his heresy, *ipso facto*, deprived of any kind of dominion and right in his kingdom, because either it remains confiscated or passes to a legitimate successor, being a Catholic, to be his by right; and nevertheless he may not be immediately deprived of his kingdom, but may justly possess and administer it, until he may, by a declaratory sentence at least, be condemned of the crime; but truly, after sentence published, he is altogether deprived of his kingdom, so that he cannot hold it by any just title. Wherefore, from thenceforward he may be treated altogether as a *tyrant*, and consequently he may be slain by any private person."

JACOBUS SIMANCHA, Bishop of Pacenza, says, *De Excommunicatione*, tit. 27, sec. 1—"If kings, or other princes, become heretics, straightway their subjects and vassals are liberated from their dominion, nor shall they recover that right, even though afterwards they should be reconciled to the Church. But it will be asked, may it be conceded to a rejected prince of this kind to leave a legitimate son and determinate heir, who has not been contaminated with the guilt of paternal crime; may not he succeed to the regal dignity? Assuredly not. Let him be cast out; for heresy is leprous and a hereditary disease; and from leprous parents leprous sons will be generated."

CRESSWELL or PHILOPATER, Jesuit, *Contra Edictum Elizabethæ*, s. 2, n. 157, writes:—"Any Christian prince, if he should manifestly deflect

* This Alan, a native of Lancashire, was a fellow of Oriel College in 1550, but so intolerant of the reformed religion that on Elizabeth's accession he departed to Louvain, where he was appointed head of the English College, and wrote in defence of the Romish Church; he also published a defence of the Pope's Bull, excommunicating Elizabeth, and exhorted her subjects to revolt, for which service he was rewarded by the Pope by being made Archbishop of Mechlin, with the dignity of a Cardinal.

from the Catholic religion, and desire to call away others, is immediately cut off from all power and dignity by the very efficacy of human and Divine right, and this before the said sentence of the supreme pastor and judge had been promulgated against him; and his subjects of every kind are freed from all obligation of any oath which they had made concerning obedience as to a lawful prince; and they may and ought, if they possess the power, eject such a one from the sovereignty of Christian men, as an apostate and deserter of Christ the Lord, and an adversary and enemy of his State, lest he should infect others, or by his example and authority turn them away from the faith; and this is the certain, definite, and unwavering opinion of the most learned men" (Jesuits).

The Cardinal BELLARMIN, *in Respons ad Apolog pro juramento fidelitatis*, writes—Long before this, we have taught that the Supreme Rector of the Universal Church hath this of right: that if a Prince fall away from the unity of the church, by heresy or schism, he may excommunicate him, or declare him excommunicated, and liberate his subjects from faith and obedience to him; nor (says he) is this a new doctrine, but approved in the Council of Lateran, the greatest and most celebrated of all, and received into use of Christian people for many ages.

The Jesuit TRESHAM, *De Officio Principis Christiani*, c. 5, writes—If a prince be heretical and obstinately and pertinaciously intolerable, he may be deposed by the Supreme Pastor, and another head appointed, to whom subjects shall attach themselves, and in just discipline and right remove from them the *tyrant*.*

MARIANA, lib. I., *De Rege et Regis institutione*, c. 6, teaches—"With such as cast away the sacred things of their ancestors (the Roman religion), we are to deal as with rabid dogs;" and—"He is to be praised who purchases public advantage at the risk of his life. A king of this kind is to be hunted up by the weapons of all, as a cruel monster brooding on the earth," in cap. 7, the title of which is "*An licet regem veneno occidere?* Whether is it lawful to slay a king by poison? And further, in reply to the question—*An facultas sit sicut armis sic et veneno herbisque lethalibus tyrannum occidere?* Whether is there permission as by arms, so also by poison and deadly herbs to kill a tyrant? *Mariana* replies—"What is the difference—whether you

* It will not be out of place here to repeat that it is under the appellation "tyrant" attached to them that kings and princes have been condemned, and Jesuits or their disciples have assassinated them, yet denied that they killed kings or princes, or instigated others to the act.

destroy by the sword or by poison? What is done by poison is done with less danger, and greater hope of impunity. According to my judgment, it is lawful to use poison, with this restriction: that he who is to be destroyed is not compelled (*non cogitur*) to drink the poison, by which, taken inwardly, he perishes; but exteriorly it may be exhibited by another, he not assisting in any way who is to be destroyed; forsooth, when such is the efficacy of the poison, that his chair, or saddle, or his clothing being impregnated or besmeared with it, it may have the power of killing him." In the end of the same chapter he concludes—"It is conceded to assail his life by every artifice, provided only that, witting or unwitting, he is not compelled to kill himself."

From teaching such as this, long-inculcated privately in Jesuit colleges until at last boldly put forward in a regular treatise by this Jesuit *Mariana*, it was that the Jesuit Richard Walpot, some time previously provided the Englishman, Edward Squire, with poison, which he was not to administer to the Queen of England or to the Earl of Essex in food or drink, but with which he was to anoint their saddles or seats, that, from contact with it, both should be deprived of life; as also a little before the nuptials of the King of Navarre and the Huguenot Massacre (St. Bartholomew's), the widowed Queen of Navarre, being friendly to the Reformers, and invited to the French Court, professedly to assist at her son's marriage, was treacherously deprived of life by means of a pair of poisoned gloves; and yet her physicians, fearing the dominant party of the day, affected to find some other way to account for her death. So pertinaciously did this *Mariana* maintain the doctrine common among the members of his order, of the lawfulness of regicide, that he openly slighted the Council of Constance, in which it was rejected, and condemned as "impious, heretical, and altogether pernicious"—saying—"I do not find this Decree (of the Council condemning regicide) approved by the Roman Pontiff Martin V., nor by Eugenius or his successors.—We know that Council was not celebrated without commotion of the Church, and the triple-headed dissent of the Pontiff*" (alluding to the three rival Popes then contending for the Pontificate.

The censorship of the book *De Rege et Regis Institutione* of Mariana, made by Peter de Onna, Provincial Master, approved even this

* Even the Councils of the Church to which they say they belong are cavilled at or contemned when their Decrees run counter to the objects of Ultramontane Jesuits. That of Constance referred to is recognised as the *seventeenth General Council* of the Catholic Church—1414-1418.

doctrine of the Jesuits, concerning regicide. The Faculty for imprinting these books, three in number, runs thus :—" I, Stephen Hojeda, Visitator of the Society of Jesus, in the Province of Toledo, by the special authority conferred on me by our Father General Claudius de Aqua-Viva (General of the Jesuit Order), grant a faculty that the three books *De Rege et Regis Institutione*, which Father Juan Mariana, of the same society, wrote and composed, forsooth *having been first approved* by grave and learned men of our said Order, may be imprinted. In confirmation of which matter I have given this letter subscribed with my name, and fortified by my seal of office in our College at Madrid, &c."

That the doctrine of Regicide had authoritative sanction from the Jesuit Society cannot, after such proofs (which are but a few out of many), be for a moment denied; neither can it be explained away; but so little were such doctrines approved in Catholic France, that the Parliament at Paris, having ordered the Faculty of Theology to be convened so soon as possible after the assassination of Henry IV., to deliberate upon the confirmation of a decree of the said Faculty previously determined upon, in which it was defined that it is not lawful for any one, for any occasion, cause, or pretext, to use violence against the persons of kings; and being assembled, the former censure of the Faculty of Theology—approved in the 15th ses. of the Synod of Constance—was recapitulated, condemning the doctrine widely disseminated by the Jesuit Confraternity, " that any *tyrant* may and ought lawfully and meritoriously to be put to death by any of his vassals or subjects, even by secret wiles and subtle blandishments or adulations, notwithstanding any oaths pledged or covenant made with him, and not awaiting the sentence of any judge," as heretical, scandalous, and soforth.

The Imperial Parliament confirmed this censure and sentence initiated by the Faculty of Theology, and Decreed: That it should be related and inscribed among the public Acts of the Parliament.

That it should be publicly read to the people in the Convent of the Faculty every year on the 4th day of June, and on the Sunday next following in all Parish and Suburban Churches.

That the book of *Juan Mariana*, Jesuit, in which the parricide of Kings and Princes is openly approved and defended, should be cast into the fire and burned in the area before the principal Church of Paris.

It lastly forbade that any one should spread or defend his doctrines either *viva voce* or in publications.

The Jesuits, therefore, the odium of Kings and Princes, and of all

good men, being excited against them and their entire Order, on account of these books of *Mariana* and others similar issuing from or approved by the members of their society, for some time declined and were held in the lowest estimation as "*Sicarii*" (assassins), in consequence of which they, for a time, changed their language; and yielding before the storm they perceived was brewing for them, they began to retract and put away the said impious doctrine in outward words; hence LUDOVICUS RICHEOMUS, Jesuit, in *Expostulat Apolog pro Societat Jesu*, c. 21, writes—"This doctrine of killing a Tyrant is mischievous, and disapproved by the Universal Church and condemned in the Council of Constance" (whose authority his associate *Mariana* rejected, as already noticed).

In the Provincial Convention also which the Jesuits held in Paris after the condemnation of Mariana's book by the Parliament, such was their duplicity and dread of public execration, they actually issued a formal mandate to the Proctor, in the name of the Province, that he would treat with the General to restrain those who published such books, from which they apprehended the disfavour of the King, and the Kingdom of France; and that he would not allow those already issued to be reprinted.

CLAUDIUS DE AQUA-VIVA, therefore, the Commander General of the Jesuits, when the Provincial Proctor related this to him, and he understood at the same time that the book of Mariana had been publicly condemned by the French Parliament, promulgated the following decree:—"*Quandoquidem Societatis Scriptoribus ac Theologis qui docent, &c.* Since it is not sufficient for the writers and theologians of the society who teach, and those co-operating with them, to provide that only which is found in the books of other writers, and, moreover, it is to be primarily considered that no opinions are to be approved which contend with established fundamentals, or are the least obnoxious to scandals or other inconveniences; therefore, truly, for most just causes which urge us to this intent, we enjoin this present decree in virtue of holy obedience under penalty of excommunication, and disqualification to any office; of suspension from sacred things, and from other things reserved at our pleasure: That henceforth no religious of our society shall publicly or privately, in reading or in consultation, much less in writing books, presume to affirm that it is lawful for any person under any pretext of *Tyranny* whatsoever to slay Kings or Princes, or to contrive their death; lest forsooth under that pretext a way should be opened to the destruction of Princes, and disturbing the peace, and their

safety should be called in question; who rather by divine command should be reverenced, and regarded as persons consecrated by the Lord God, and appointed to that degree, for the happy government of peoples; but Provincials who may come to the knowledge of any of those things, and do not either amend or prevent inconvenience of this kind, by causing that this decree be strictly observed, we will that they should not only incur the aforesaid penalties, but that they be also deprived of their office, so that all may know what is the sense of the society in this matter, and not that the error of an individual should cause the entire society to be suspected, &c."

This decree seems very explicit, and would no doubt satisfy many, but we question its integrity, knowing that the book of MARIANA had been previously reviewed and approved of, as before shown, by learned and grave men of the society, and imprinted under the before-cited faculty granted by Stephen Hojeda, appointed by the same AQUAVIVA visitator of the society in Toledo. We have also the facts before us that Mariana's books were eleven years in circulation with the sanction of the Jesuit Society and its General, highly commended by *Stephen Hojeda*, as "the three elegant and important books compiled and written by *Juan Mariana*, which he had read diligently and carefully, and would do so again, and a third time, if time and leisure permitted, so much did they please him on the once reading;" and that no correction was administered, no check placed upon their circulation, until the Parliament condemned them and ordered them to be burned, and they were found to be entailing penalties on the society, exciting hostility to it, and curtailing its freedom and operation.

But as further evidence that *Aqua-viva's* condemnation was but an act of temporizing and bending to the blast of public odium until it should pass over, we may adduce the very significant fact that the Jesuit, Cardinal *Bellarmin* (so much admired by Dr. Cullen), wrote, after the condemnation of Mariana's book, a treatise of the same import on the power of the Pope in temporal matters, condemned, indeed, for its infamous, detestable, and immoral teachings by the Paris Parliament; but out of respect for the high position of the Cardinal, not ordered to be burned, as were the books of Mariana; in relation to which the following is a condensed extract of the judicial act of the French Parliament on the subject:—

"A book being viewed in the Curia, bearing the title '*Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in Temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaiium, authore Roberto, S. R. E. Cardinali Bellarmini, &c.*'

The said court of Parliament proclaims to all of whatsoever order and condition they may be, and forbids, under penalty of the crime of high treason, that any shall have or retain for himself, or convey to another, or imprint, or expose to sale, the said book, which contains a false and most detestable maxim that tends to the overthrow of the supreme power constituted of God, renders subjects seditious against their princes, seduces them from lawful authority, and induces them to attempt nefarious acts against life and dignity, and to venture to disturb the public peace. It commands, moreover, those who have copies of that pernicious book (Bellarmin's), or know others to have them, to inform the Judges in Ordinary, who shall inquire concerning the matter, at the instance of the Deputies, &c., and pass judgment on those so accused according to law and equity; likewise it prohibits, under similar penalty, any doctor or professor in schools or colleges, or other places, from discoursing, disputing, or writing in reference to that maxim, or in any manner whatsoever daring to teach it to others."

Pronounced in Parliament, &c. &c.

So well was it understood by Jesuits that the order of their General, *Aqua-viva*, was a mere artifice to divert the odium which *Mariana's* book had entailed upon the Society in France, that in the fourth year after it was issued

Franciscus Suarez, Jesuit, another of Dr. Cullen's orthodox and brilliant exemplars to the Irish clergy, polished up anew the same regicidal doctrine, and republished it, *Aqua-viva* still living, which book, because it contained the very same doctrine as the previous books of Mariana and Bellarmin, was in like manner condemned by the Parliament in Paris, and publicly burned by the common executioner. The following is a brief of the decreet in reference thereto :—

Viso a Curia, &c.: A book imprinted at Cologne in the present year, with this title, " Francisci Suarez, *Granatensis e'Societate Jesu Doctoris Theologi, Defensio Fidei Catholicæ et Apostolicæ adversus Anglicanæ sectæ errores*," &c., being viewed in the senate, containing many propositions, &c.: "The court declares the propositions and maxims in said book contained to be scandalous and malicious, and to tend to the overthrow of States, and the influencing of subjects to lay violent hands on the sacred persons of supreme kings and princes, &c. Wherefore, it has decreed and decrees, that the said book of Suarez shall be burnt in the Court of the Palace by the minister of final justice. Likewise, it interdicts all booksellers and printers from imprinting,

selling, or exchanging same ; and all persons, of whatever condition, to have, write, hold, or teach in schools or elsewhere, or to dispute on the same maxims and propositions, &c.—*Actum in Parliamenti*, &c., 26, Jun. 1614."

Moreover, the parliament decrees that the Fathers, Ignatius Armandus, Rector* in this city, Cotton, and Fronton, be called the next day into Court, and that it be shown to them that the book of *Suarez* has been both imprinted and brought into this city against the declaration and decree of their general in 1610, and against the authority of their king, and the security of his State and person ; and that it be enjoined on them that they signify to their general that he ought both to renew the same decree, and publish it, which thing they should apply themselves to within six months, and provide that books of this kind should in future neither be composed nor given to the public from their society, containing propositions so damnable and pernicious.

This book of the Jesuit Suarez, which is to the present day an authority among the members of his society as to its doctrine, having been thus condemned by the Catholic Parliament of Paris, and publicly burned by the common executioner; in the following year a declaration relative to it and those which preceded it was published through the States of France, as follows :—

" Impious doctrine having originated in former years, and been propagated in seditious books, which undermine the power of the supreme magistrate : whereas of the undoubted right of the king it is sufficiently manifest to all that since for him who has received supreme power immediately from God Himself, He wills that he should be submissively sought and acknowledged, and regarded by all, so He does not permit that any other power, whether ecclesiastical or political, should deprive him of so much of his right in respect to his royal majesty as to pretend that any can, for any cause, absolve his subjects from obedience to him. Forsooth, this memorable rule, agreeable to the Divine word, and especially suited for the conservation of public safety, should be held by all subjects, of whatsoever state or condition, for a sacred and inviolable law, and *by all and singular officers and ministers, before they become participators of benefices, or are admitted to their offices, shall be accepted on oath, and confirmed by their proper seal and signature*; but the contrary to this, and that especially that it is lawful either to

* *Rectors :* those who hold the chief place in the colleges and residentiary houses of the Jesuits, in which their power is uncontrolled and absolute : *libera et absoluta.*

slay kings or to deprive them of anything, or to withdraw obedience from them, it decrees to be impious and opposed to truth and public interest, and all books in which that may be found prescribed to be seditious, execrable, and damnable; and their authors, whosoever they may be, writing, and setting them forth in public; if foreigners, are to be considered as sworn enemies of the royal majesty; if natives, whatever may be their state or condition, they are to be considered seditious, rebels, violators of the laws, and guilty of high treason. It is commanded, therefore, to all parents that they shall diligently inculcate this rule on their children, teachers on their pupils, professors on students, and preachers on hearers. But if, in any book issued by foreign ministers or doctors of the Church, anything either directly or indirectly is advanced against this rule, necessity is imposed upon ecclesiastics of the same ranks of refuting it, without any respect of persons, if they would not incur the crime of high treason." Having thus briefly, but we hope sufficiently for the occasion, exhibited the character of SUAREZ, the approved of Dr. Cullen, and of his associates of the Jesuit order, as shown in their impious and detestable doctrines, we close our tract on the Ultramontane-Jesuitism at present operating in Ireland by a code of advices emanating from CLAUDIUS DE AQUAVIVA, fifth General of the Order. A translation of these Private Advices, which have, we believe, been scarcely, if at all, known in this country, detailing, with an intimate knowledge of human nature and its weaknesses, the methods prescribed no less than two centuries and a half ago to be practised by Jesuit priests and confessors to promote their Society to the possession of wealth, and to positions of influence; and which, in our daily experience of what is taking place in the political world, in the domestic circle, and in the chambers of the dying, and through the occasional revelations of the probate court, we see are being acted upon even now in their entirety, so far as circumstances will admit of it, we feel convinced will not be considered either uninstructive or uninteresting.

MONITA PRIVATA.

Private Advices. (Society of Jesus.)

1. How ought the Society to act when it receives a foundation in a new locality?

In order that the Society may render itself agreeable and acceptable to the inhabitants of a place which had not so received it before, the exposition of the aim of the Society (as prescribed in the second rule of the summary) "to labour for the salvation of its neighbours equally as for its own," will conduce much; wherefore, there should be an humble officiousness in going about the hospitals, and in visiting those lying in filth, and in journeying even to distant places, to receive confessions of any, no matter who they may be. Alms should be gathered in and given to poor persons, *in the view of others*, that edified by our act they may be the more liberal toward us; all should so learn outward decorum, that by it they may edify others; let offenders, especially in relation to that, be dismissed from among ours.

2. What is necessary to be done that we may become more powerful through the most intimate friendship of princes and magistrates?

The greatest efforts should be directed toward this end. Experience has taught that princes may be best disposed towards spiritual and ecclesiastical persons when their most odious deeds are not harshly reprehended, but are set out in a more favorable light, that is discovered in marriage contracts of princes with those of kin to them, which marriages are attended with great difficulty because of the opinion of the common people execrating such nuptials. Therefore, when these and similar things engage the mind of princes, they should be stimulated to pursue those objects which they desire: considerations should be unfolded which may increase their inclination; namely, that the marriage should take place because of a higher obligation, and the glory of God; so when a prince essays to do anything not alike agreeable to all his nobles (for argument sake, if he should wish to make war), then his will is to be confirmed, and his mind admonished and prevailed on to constancy. *They** should put it into the minds of the principal men of

* Wherever the word "they" or "ours" appears in italics as above, members of the Jesuit order are those meant. These advices should be read as

the kingdom, and persuade them to be obedient to the will of the prince. *They* should not, however, descend to particulars, lest it should be imputed to *Ours*. If, however, it is put upon them, the general monitions prohibiting such a thing to *Ours* should be cited.

It will aid toward contracting the familiarity of princes, to undertake embassies, on matters agreeable to them; the familiars of princes are to be overcome by presents, that they may faithfully instruct *Ours* concerning the morals and humours of the prince, in what things he takes delight, what way there is of pleasing him, saving, however, the law of virtue and of conscience; and the opportunity being had, *They* should insinuate themselves into the purposes of magnates and princes; if they want wives, virgins should be proposed to them for marriage, who together with their parents are addicted to *Ours*, and the virgins should be painted with those high colours of praises in which the princes themselves would wish them to be depicted; for so it will be that, through their wives, *Ours* will render those, otherwise estranged, friendly to us. Experience has taught that through the house of Austria, in the kingdom of Poland, of France, and in other Dukedoms and Empires.

Lest females should change their minds, and grow slack in their favour towards *Ours*, a love of our Society should be earnestly inculcated on them, as well by *Ours* as by their female attendants who are favourable to us, and who by various civilities and presents may be retained in friendship to us; for so they will divulge the more secret things of their mistresses, and those things which it behoves *Ours* to acquire a knowledge of.

In ruling the consciences of magnates, *They* should follow the opinions of those authorities who allow of a more uncontrolled conscience, against the opinions of monks, that these being rejected, they may follow us and depend upon our directions and counsels. Wherefore, as well to conciliate magnates and princes as also prelates, it will aid to make those partakers of the privileges of our Order, to have ample faculties of absolving from reserved sins and censures, of granting dispensations in the matter of fasts, in the connubial obligation (*debito reddendo*), in impediments of marriage, and in other vows. They

addressed *by* the general of the order *to* the superiors, *for* the instruction and guidance of the associates under their direction, in order to understand the peculiar and otherwise ambiguous construction of some of the sentences, and also the use of the word "ours," where the word "we," or "us" might appear to be preferable, but which, if used, would not convey the strict import of the original.

should be invited to our schools, they should be honored in verse. Theses should be inscribed to them, they should be entertained in the dining hall, and if the condition of the person require it, let him be addressed in various languages during the time of the repast by our brethren. *They* should compose enmities between great men; but if any principal man alienated from us should serve a monarch addicted to us, favors should be promised to him, and honors conferred on him at the instigation of *Ours*. Finally, *They* should make it their concern that princes and magnates, as well as prelates, should be so affected towards our society that they would act for it against their kinsfolk and those dear to them, nor in any way promote those discarded by the Society. *They* should initiate honors to be paid to men of high estate. *They* should congratulate in poems by the learned those delegated to authority, on their first entry to a place where their jurisdiction will be exercised.

3. What things Lords, who, though destitute of money, are, nevertheless, of much authority in the State, and can be profitable to us in other ways, may see to on our account.

If such be secular lords, favor and assistance may be procured from them against our adversaries; favor to litigated suits; authority and power towards the purchasing of villas, houses, gardens, and materials for constructing the domiciles of our society, especially in those cities which are unwilling to have us. Those same lords are to be conciliated, to the end that they may mitigate, or even restrain, the anger of men of inferior note against us, *Ours* keeping in the back ground; but from spiritual lords, as bishops or archbishops, according to the diversity of nations, that is to be exacted which the seasonableness of the matter may point out. In some places care is to be taken that prelates and parish priests subject to them should hold *Ours* in reverence, and not hinder our ministrations; in other places more. For in Germany and Poland the authority of bishops is great, who, with little exertion, the thing being collated with the prince, might assign to *Ours*, monasteries, parishes, provostships, foundations of altars, by some satisfaction being made to the secular priests. That *Ours* might be able to accomplish in those places where heretics and schismatics are mixed up with Catholics, and it should be shown to bishops that they would reap great fruit by these means, which, from secular priests and monks, *præter cantum*, they cannot expect. The zeal of those (bishops) should be praised; let a perpetual memorial of their act be inculcated. But such foundations (that the society should succeed to

the benefices of secular priests) may be easily attained through those bishops who are both confessed by *Ours*, and depend on our direction, and are looking to the higher grade of a more opulent episcopate through our mediation. But as well with bishops as with princes, *Ours* should take care that when they found our colleges at parish churches that we may be they who alone shall have the right of conferring perpetual vicariate with cure of souls. The Superior himself of the place for the time being will be parish priest, and let the entire regimen of the church be ours. *They* should, through the same, provide for the erection of our colleges in places where there are academicians having antipathies to us, or Catholic or heretic citizens forbidding foundations to us in their cities, those same (bishops) should provide *Ours* with pulpits (*Cathedras concionatorias*) in the principal churches of their most noble citizens. If at any time a canonization of any of *Ours* is about to be transacted, it will be the business of *Ours* to move forward the children of magnates to the Apostolic See. If an embassy from these lords should happen to go round, lest other religious who resemble us being taken notice of, they might transfer their favour to them, and introduce them into those provinces in which *Ours* are eminent; such illustrious men, if passing through the provinces where *Ours* are, should be entertained at our colleges, and treated according to religious decorum.

4. What should be regarded by Preachers and Confessors of Kings and Princes?

That the aims of Kings and Princes and illustrious men may be rightly ordered by *Ours*, *They* should by every means direct them, as their own aim may appear to tend, toward that private knowledge as to their designs, which the same princes entrust them with: not immediately however, but by little and little, the direction ought to have a view to external political government, wherefore *They* should ofttimes impress on Princes that the distribution of honors and dignities in the State should have regard to justice, and that God will be grievously offended by Princes if they sin against this. *They* should say that they themselves however are unwilling to thrust themselves into any administration of the State, and that they say these things by constraint, because of their office; but when they lay hold of the ear of Princes, it should be explained to them with what virtues men should be endued taking State dignities upon them: these to be made the subjects of commendation should be taken from among the friends of our society, and from those men whom it is expedient for the good of the society to promote; whom Princes should not nominate of themselves, but

through the most intimate friends of the society, and of the Prince: wherefore Confessors and Preachers should be informed by *Ours* what men are such in any part of his dominion; and what their quality, power, riches, or liberality toward us may be: *They* should have the names of these with them, and make them known to the Prince, by dexterously commending them, that the more easily on the occasion offering, these may be promoted by Princes, whom they had heard formerly praised to them by their Confessors and Preachers.

Confessors and Preachers of Princes should be mindful to handle them tenderly and by no means to straight-lace them (*nulla ratione perstringere*) in sermons or in private conversations. *They* should accept of delicacies and distilled liquors in moderation. For their private use *They* should be content with a small amount of money; while *They* are in palaces *They* should betake themselves to the more humble chambers. *They* should discreetly inculcate on their Princes that they should not depart by a nail's breadth from the counsel of their Spiritual Fathers. *They* should take care that as soon as possible the death of State officials should be signified to them, and act in time concerning those to be substituted for them. That *They* may free themselves from suspicion of external influence, *They* should not of themselves promote the cause of their own friends with Princes, but should rather entrust that to others.

5. What is to be done with Religious who by symbolizing with *Ours* in many occupations detract much from us?

This race of men is to be courageously endured by *Ours;* next it should be inculcated on men, that our order possesses the perfection of all religion; and in whatsoever other Religious excel, in that in a more eminent manner our society shines in the Church of God; that over and above their canting and coarseness of diet (in which we differ from monks) all things are to be had better in our society, even things the very same in kind; defects are to be brought under notice, from which it may be shown that other Religious can less happily afford satisfaction, even in the same occupations, in which they concur with us. Greater effort is to be made against those Religious who desire to found schools for the instruction of youth, in places where our society has set about that with credit and profit. It should be shown to Princes that such men would be for disturbing the State. It should be set before extern Academicians that these Religious, more than we, would be their ruin. *They* should suggest to Princes that the society is sufficient to the instruction of youth; but if these Religious have letters of Pontiffs

or commendations of Cardinals in their favor, *Ours* should operate through the Princes with the Pontiff, to whom it should be shown that the Society can well discharge the duty of its own ability. *They* should procure testimonials of a good conversation from cities in which *They* have their colleges; together with these, let him be also earnestly persuaded that disturbances are to be feared by the admittance of divers schools and preceptors. Be it they are religious, notwithstanding, *Ours* according to their ability should take care that exercises be engaged in and essays published (which will meet) with the applause of others.

6. Of conciliating opulent Widows to our Society.

Fathers of mature age, with a lively complexion, should be delegated to this work. These same widows should be frequently visited by *Ours*. Which of them exhibits partiality to the Society, in return the works of our Society should be offered to her; if she accepts them and begins to frequent our Churches, such a confessor should be given her as will well direct and cause her to be constant in maintaining widowhood, by enumerating the advantages of widowhood, through which she may attain greater merit. That the entire affair may fall out better, let her be persuaded to diminish the retinue of her servants; let officials of the mansion, and managers of her effects, be appointed, who shall superintend the government of her house with consideration for the place and person; but firstly, her confessor should accomplish that the widow may acquiesce in his counsel and follow his direction, as the foundation of her spiritual welfare hereafter. The frequent use of the Sacraments, the hearing of the Sacred Office, and the recitation of Litanies should be prescribed for her; twice or thrice weekly, exhortations should be renewed concerning the advantages of widowhood, the troubles of matrimony, and its new dangers and grievances; facetiously *he* (her confessor) should place before her noble men, of whom their widows (the matter being by some means handled with them) did not refuse marriage, and their husbands should be so described, by declaring their immoralities and their vices, that hearing them the widow may not take thought of marriage; then when they are by such means inclined to widowhood, as soon as possible religious vows are to be commended to them; that having expressed the vow of chastity, they may close every access for themselves to second nuptials; at which time they are to be especially prevailed upon to drive away from their halls young men too free in pleasantries (*liberiores in jocis*); a few guests may be admitted, and in those to be entertained let there be mediocrity. Stewards of country places, sacellans and other officials, should be such

as are had upon our recommendation, or may be dependent upon our nod; when progress has been so far made, the widow will be drawn by little and little to good works, which however she will perform according to the direction of her spiritual father.

7. What is the mode of preserving widows in their widowhood; and of the disposition of the incomes they possess?

If besides a general regard, a widow should evidence by valuable gifts, or by a more than ordinary sum of money, her liberality toward the Society, let her be made a participator of the merits of our Society. If she have made a vow of chastity, she should renew it in our manner twice yearly; the domestic arrangement of our Society should be explained to her, which, if it please her, may be prescribed for her mansion. Monthly confessions (*confessiones menstruæ*) should be appointed to her, also before the festivals of Christmas, the Blessed Virgin, and of the Apostles. Syndics should be set among her male and female domestics, who should note defaults among her servants, and relate them to their mistress.

Signs, whispers, and clandestine discourses should be prohibited, delinquents should be severely punished, girls of good repute should be in the house, who, in making various ornaments for the churches, might exercise themselves in piety; they should have a manager over them who would attend to them at work and teach them morals. Widows should be visited frequently, and preserved and cherished by mirthful, at the same time spiritual conversation; they should not be dealt strictly with in confession, unless when the hope is small of anything being received from them; it will profit, moreover, toward keeping widows, if those many things be allowed which are agreeable to widows, as ingress to our temples, conversations whenever and with whoever of *Ours* may be pleasing to them; they should not be permitted to leave home in inclement weather, or when they think it might be injurious to them; the nuptials of their daughters should be graced by poems of the most accomplished externs. If funeral solemnities are to be performed, mournful, at the same time, splendid ornature should be exhibited; the structure of the cenotaph should not be commonplace. Finally, whatever can be afforded to the sensuality of widows (*quicquid fieri potest ad viduarum sensualitatem*), provided only they are liberal and heartily addicted to our society, let it be done, *cautiously however, and shutting out scandal.*

In acting concerning the disposition of incomes which widows have, that lauded perfection of the state of the saints should be proposed to

them, when their friends being disregarded, they impoverished themselves, alienating their goods to Jesus Christ; instances of widows should be adduced, who, by these means, in a short time, mounted up to the saints; wherefore when widows resign themselves to our hands, prepared to follow the direction of their spiritual father, it should be earnestly impressed, in order that their acts may be of greater merit before God, that they should not bestow charities on religious unknown to their confessor. But having noted those who they intend to give anything to, they should exhibit the scroll to their confessor, who can take away from, or add to it, as shall appear fit. Confessors should beware of the approach of other religious to widows, lest they should lead away females (by nature inconstant) after them—so long as there are much moneys to be collected from their properties; lest widows might be moved by them to second marriages; confessors should propose, and persuade them, to make regular pensions whereby they might annually lessen the necessities of our colleges and profest houses, especially of our profest house at Rome. They might expend some of the same money on priests' garments and the permanent things of the temple, which might serve for our religious houses after the widow's decease; the deficiencies of our churches, and the imperfect structures of our colleges, are to be exposed before widows; they should be induced to undertake expenditures for matters which would conciliate for them eternal glory; it should be set before them that there are temples, ciboria, edifices which, promptly determining about them, might be finished; that they have wherewithal they might exercise their liberality, in doing the very same as benefactors and princes who have erected something sumptuously for us. They should be persuaded that these things have been consecrated to eternity, if they are given by widows, to the sepulchres of our beatified at Rome: that is to be confirmed by the examples of other matrons, who performed the like. It should be shown that by these means they would be attaining to the highest perfection, if, while rooting out of themselves the love of earthly things, they appointed Christ the Lord the possessor of those things, through his servants of the (Jesuit) society; but if they will to dedicate sons or daughters to the service of God, their liberality is not to be contemned, accepting whatever may be offered; more sparingly, however, is it to be obtained from those widows who design their sons and daughters for secular pursuits.

8. Of remedies, that sons and daughters of our female devotees may embrace the religious state.

Discreetly and perseveringly should we act toward a widow mother; but to daughters, let her become irksome by rods, by threats, by fastings, by rough treatment, by denying much sought for female adornments, by promising a greater portion, if she is willing to become a nun. Let *him* (the mother's confessor) exaggerate the rages of a future husband, and the grievances of matrimony; let her mother profess her sorrow that she had not been a nun; finally, let it be so acted toward daughters, that, subdued by the irksomeness of remaining with their mother, they may aspire to a nunnery. With sons, *Ours* should converse familiarly; they should be introduced to our colleges, in which these things should be shown them which may move them to enter our Society. How there are pleasure grounds adjoining our colleges, in which they may recreate themselves; agreeable intercourse among *Ours*, such as is outside (in the world), should be made to appear in our refectories; gifts and pleasant familiarity should not be omitted. Let there be about such sons of widows, teachers most friendly to us; so in course of time they will become some of *Ours*: the mother should withdraw necessaries from her sons, a little at a time; she should set forth that her property is entangled. If they should go to other provinces for the sake of their studies, the mother should not treat them liberally there with money, so that, overcome with weariness in strange countries, they may seriously contemplate to enter religion.

9. Of increasing the Incomes of Colleges.

It should be seriously inculcated by Confessors of princes, magnates, and matrons that whilst they (Confessors) confer spiritual things on them, they should receive temporal things from them, for the common good of the society; wherefore, they (Confessors) should not neglect occasions for receiving anything while it may be offered; and if it be deferred, let them recall it to remembrance, exhibiting excessive regard least of all for themselves; let confessors who shall be least industrious in such matters, as if too little concerned for the common good, be removed from princes, and let them be harassed in the house (of residence). We have heard with great grief that young widows, prevented by untimely death, through the fault of *Ours*, have not bequeathed to us very much valuable furnishings for our temples; nor did *They* put themselves in the way to receive it, while the widows were alive; when to the acquiring of such things, not the convenience, but the inclination, of the person offering ought to have been looked to. Let *Them* go to the houses of citizens, to the halls of nobles, also of widows; from all of whom *They* should make diligent inquiry, whether for the good of their souls, either

they, or their friends, or kinsfolk, are about to bequeath anything to the church; the same is to be diligently inquired by Parish Priests and Prelates, who may be first introduced to discharge spiritual offices; at which time *Ours* may be able to gain many things. Among those, let *All* study to entrap benevolence, by displaying the gratitude of the Society, and their faithful performance in regard to matters committed to them by benefactors, very different from secular priests and monks. *They* should acquire knowledge of the gardens, quarries, and vineyards of the people among whom they reside; of the properties in cities, and estates in the country; by what possessors, by what contracts, subject to what incumbrances they are held, and they should try whether they may be able to possess those properties, either by contracts or the reception of sons into society, or by donation. In time our colleges may make a sale of their properties to devotees, male or female, of our Society, with a condition that after a short time the Society shall resume the same from them gratis (without any repayment). If it should happen to widows addicted to us to have daughters only, they (confessors) should guide them to the religion of the nunneries, with whatsoever portion is given to them: the rest, as villas, jewels, and the intact estate, we may easily gain. If, however, any widow, a friend to the Society, have one son or more, and there is no hope that the sons or son should enter the Society, it should be indicated to the mother that it will be sufficient if she leave the intact estate to her son or sons; but the accumulated sum of money, which is her own personal dowry, she can bequeath to the society. It may happen that widows inclined to piety may be possessed of one or two villages, or tracts of land. These should be induced to make over their possessions, by deed, to our colleges; they themselves being satisfied to receive an annual sufficiency thereout, that they may the more conveniently be intent on God, being free from the care of temporal things.

10. Of the strictness of discipline to be observed in Society.

Testimony should be borne to the strictness of discipline by ejecting those from among *Ours* (whensoever it may appear fit to the Society), be they young or old, or of whatever state and condition, who may have wasted their life and strength and become affected by (. . . .)* disease after they have entered the Society. These (besides reserved cases (. . . .)* on account of which dismissal will be lawful) will

* In order that no objection may exist to placing *Monita Privata* in the hands of females or young persons, it has been considered desirable to omit a few passages from this and from the 14th sec.

be causes of ejection. If any direct our female devotees, or male friends, useful to the Society, to other religious ; or if they should indicate to parents or to those by whom they are impeded that they themselves ought not enter the Society, or if on the resignation of their goods they show consideration for their kinsfolk, in not giving the entire to the Society: first of all however let them for some years be mortified in society; let the brothers be placed in degrading offices, let them be detained in inferior schools to teach there, let not the higher studies, especially the fourth year of theology, be conceded to them: chapters should be assigned to them more frequently through the month; let the fathers be prohibited from hearing their confessions, let them be debarred any intercourse with externs, let things prized by them be removed from their chambers; frequent penances should be publicly assigned to them; hence it will be easy to proceed to their dismissal. If such persons noted in the above named vices should make their complaint before Provincials of unreasonable Superiors or officials, it will not be easily credited, the thing done will be excused, it will be said that they are bound to obey their Superior in whatsoever is not sinful.

Superiors need not be scrupulous in dismissals, for since our order rejoices in the name of a Society, and of Associates, it is not to be wondered at that dismissal should be annexed to our Society; for the bonds of Society and Associates are easily dissolved, nor are they perpetual. Dismission has its beginning with the institution of Society; that evidently appears from this, because the Society holds simple vows, on the part of those made scholastics and coadjutors, which vows have not a mutual binding; as if the Society should be under the obligation of retaining persons with such vows always in Society, but that is by no means so; for the obligation only falls on the person making the vow, not on the Society, which can dismiss whomsoever it will, notwithstanding such vows, whenever and for whatever cause may seem fit to it; but even though in the Society some might make a profession of the four vows, others of the three usual vows, after the manner of other monks, nevertheless even such may be dismissed the Society.

11. After what manner *ours* shall as by one mind perform their part toward the dismissed.

Since such could do much hurt to our Society, for that reason it should be met by those means: before they are dismissed from the Society they should promise and leave a declaration to the effect that they will say nothing unfavorable concerning the Society. *They* should preclude the dismissed person from access to those spiritual and secular

lords whose favour he might hunt after, and in that way obtain a position: let his evil inclinations, vices, and defects be told, which of himself in confession "*in manifestatione conscientiæ*" he may at any time have discovered to his Superiors, and according to which he was directed in the Society, giving credit to this as being on his own authority; but if there shall be lords not addicted to us, care should be taken through men of importance devoted to us that favor to the dismissed from him not addicted to us should be hindered; and if he cannot be induced to avert his friendship from the dismissed, at least he may be prevailed upon not altogether to favor him. It should be written to the colleges, who are dismissed, and the causes of their dismissal should be set out to view with exaggerations. Of the dismissed it should be said in exhortations that he earnestly sought to be admitted again into the Society. To externs those causes of his dismissal should be insinuated, on account of which the common people hold us in odium; for so the dismissal of any one whatever will be the more plausible.

If the dismissed should obtain credence in speaking against us, this matter is to be met by our grave men, who may oppose to the word of the dismissed the authority of our Society, its fame, the fruit it produces to the Church of God, the high esteem entertained of its life and doctrine, because of which they are Confessors and Counsellors to Princes and Magnates. *They* should declare our zeal towards neighbours, how much rather towards each individual belonging to the Society; those among whom the dismissed may appear to have partizans should be invited to refections, during which they should be persuaded that they ought not to favor the dismissed and that they should presume *Ours* to be constrained by religion (in dismissing him): at which time (of repast) *They* should explain the causes of dismissal by showing every probability to them, and exposing clearly all the defects of the dismissed, omitting nothing. Be it that some things (alleged against him) are doubtful: they should beware of promoting dismissed persons to any ecclesiastical favors, unless either they give a liberal sum of money, or charge their goods by a deed, or testify in a particular manner that they are friends of the society. Confessors should also persuade both Princes and Kings that in order to honors being bestowed on any one they should receive a proof by his founding a college or doing something similar of his liberality and good will toward our society.

If it happen that the dismissed obtain the good will of men, diligent inquiry should be made into their lives, and let *Them* publish their im-

moralities and defects through our male friends and our female devotees of the lower order (*Ordinis inferioris*). To the end that those (female devotees) should not favour the dismissed nor keep the dismissed near them, let them be terrified by censures; let absolution be denied them if they prove perverse. Praise of the dismissed should be frittered away, by counteracting and ambiguous inuendoes, as a means which may turn away the friendship of men from the dismissed, and lessen his credit. The misfortunes which befal dismissed persons should be revealed in exhortations, with great appearance of commiseration, that others may be affrighted and even though unwilling remain in Society.

12. Of the choice of youths for the Society, and in what manner they are to be retained.

There is need of exceeding great art and industry, that youths of good capacity may be won, in mien not despicable, noble of family, and opulent. That such may be drawn in, favor is to be shown to them by the principals of schools; they should not be permitted to be harassed by the teachers; they should be frequently praised, rewards should be given them, they should be taken to the gardens, they should be treated to fruits; on the accustomed feasts, they should be received at the Refectory. With those of a different class, resort is to be had to rods, faults are to be attributed to them from conjectures of any sort; an angry countenance is to be shown to them; they should be very sharply coerced and reprehended, youth should be displayed as in them prone to all evils; they are to be affrighted with eternal damnation unless they become religious; when they seek to be admitted into Society they should not be immediately admitted, but should be put off for a time; in the interim, let them be encouraged; in conversations let the delightful course of life be commended to them; for so with greatly increasing desire they will the more eagerly press to be admitted; and if any such should afterwards wish to withdraw, let the ardent zeal be recalled to him with which he urged his entrance into Society.

But since the difficulty is very great in alluring the sons of senators, and of the richer men of a country, if such there be, they should be sent to Rome for the novitiate; previously, however, the general or Roman provincial should be forewarned; but if they should come into Germany, France, or Italy, and earnestly desire the Society, let them be undertaken in those dominions in which the monarch is addicted to the Society; for under such a lord these and like things will be achieved; as the subjects of such an one, since they may want our favor, will not easily withstand us, and if they should they will gain nothing.

The occasions should not be neglected of drawing over the sons of those who come for the sake of their studies to our schools from other provinces, especially when they begin to lose money, and partly through shame for the money lost, partly through fear of parents or relatives, allow themselves to be drawn over because of the troubles which they apprehend; this thing has had good success among the Germans and Poles.

Waverings are to be met, according to the quality of the person, by exhortations concerning the ill luck of the dismissed; but that parents or relatives of those entering may be content with regard to us, the excellency of our institute, and the great applause of the world, and the honour which is paid by princes to our society, should be exhibited to them. *They* should insinuate themselves into the closest familiarity of those, and render them satisfied, if necessity and the dignity of the person shall demand it.

13.—Of Nuns.

Our confessors should be cautious of offending nuns, since they are such benefactresses, that some have aided to the foundation of our colleges, and very many have given a moderate endowment, the nunnery and abbess assenting; wherefore, *They* should not molest these nuns in any matter concerning their cloister; *They* should leave them to the bishops; *They* should rather maintain the favor of nuns, lest they should act against us, in the matter of divided dowries, and disapprove of those to be given to us.

14.—Of Reserved Cases, and Causes of dismissing from Society.

Besides the cases described in the instruction, from which the superior only may absolve, or an ordinary confessor by leave from him (those cases—viz.* . . . . .), let *them* know there are other causes of dismission from the society, nor may they be absolved before they have promised that they would discover it of themselves, or through their confessor to the superior *out of confession*, who, if he shall perceive that one has sinned with an accomplice, or to the serious injury of the Society, shall not grant absolution, unless the penitent promises, either that he himself would write concerning the matter to the General, or that he would give permission to his Confessor or Superior to write about such a case: otherwise he should by no means absolve the penitent; but the General (the lapse of the penitent being known, and the affair conferred with the secretary) shall make such adjudication on the fault of the penitent

* See note to Sec. 10.

as he will see to be advantageous to the Society; and shall assign dismissal from the Society to such penitent, which, if he thinks fit to cavil at, never can he be validly absolved.

We have concluded with our theologians, that such should be done in reserved cases; and with the approval of the Apostolic See, some contending in vain against it. Let the Confessor, however, be silent concerning that for which the penitent is dismissed the Society. If the penitent should tell it of himself *out of confession*, let him be dismissed; if he should be unwilling to tell it, let the ordinance inscribed against dissemblers be observed with him: but so long shall he not be absolved* as he shall be unwilling to tell it *out of confession.*

If any of our Confessors should hear from any extern person of the other sex that she has had a disgraceful transaction with a male of our Society, they should not absolve her before she tells it *out of confession*, and if she should so tell it, let *Ours* be dismissed—let the extern person be absolved.

If two of *Ours should* (*sin*),† let him who would not discover it be dismissed, let the other be absolved, he is the more preferable of the two who first makes it known—let him be retained in society, but let him be mortified so that, willing or not, after the intervention of a little stay, he shall follow the other.

The Society also can since it is such a constitution disburden itself of persons for these causes, if in the course of time it discovers these to be coarse in manners and language; it may even see further causes—*They* may dismiss any from the Society by a General monition—that they may be dismissed with the less trouble, let them be harassed; let everything be done against their inclinations, let them be denied what they seek, let them have little of anything, let them be repelled from the higher studies, let them be placed under such instructors as they

* *Johannes Heureux*, Jesuit, in Apologia writes—"A Priest should not reveal any confession for any cause whatever, not even if the life of a King or the destruction of a Province depended on it." *Fronto*, Jesuit, says—"Better all should perish than even once the seal of confession should be violated." *Suarez*, Jesuit—Lib. de. Pœnitent, disp. 14, s.i. writes—In no case, and for no end, even for the preservation of the entire commonwealth, from the greatest evil, temporal and spiritual, would it be lawful to violate it. And yet the 11th sec. of *Monita* counsels what looks like a breach of the secret of confession in the case of a dismissed person whose character it is thought desirable to break down. And in this 14th sec., the ingenious method of withdrawing secrets which affect the Society from under the seal of confession, by withholding absolution until the penitent tells them "*out of confession*," is prescribed. Confessors, by adopting such a course in other matters, might, no doubt, have often placed themselves in positions to have prevented the perpetration of the greatest crimes, had it suited their policy to have done so.

† It is unnecessary to be more definite for the reason already assigned.

are discontented with, nor let such be retained in society who being harassed rebel against their Superior, and complain of him before their brethren, or tell in order to displease him what things are done in Society as to widows, and the direction of public affairs, or who praise the Venetians by whom our Society was expelled. Immediately before dismissal let the person about to be dismissed be intensely disquieted, let him be removed from his prescribed office, and sent to perform now this now that business; during which time he is to be reprimanded that he did not properly execute the business committed to him. For a slight digression let the more severe penances be assigned to him: during meal times his defaults should be read out aloud from the chair, so that he may be put to shame; and while he exhibits marked impatience, others hearing and seeing it, let him be dismissed, as one who is a scandal; first however let his acts be reviewed, and let him be ordered to go to the garden or to a neighbouring college; notwithstanding in that place where he would least wish it to be done, there let him be dismissed.

15. Who of the personages of the society ought to be maintained and kept.

The active laborers, who promote not only the spiritual but also the temporal good of the society, should have the first consideration; such are the Confessors of opulent widows, who, when they become infirm, should be removed from widows, and others should be supplied to them of fresher vigor and age (*recentibus viribus et ætate*). To those (aged Confessors) should be allowed whatsoever they seek in food, clothing, and other things, nor are they to be harassed by penance servitors. Against such Superiors should not be credulous. Regard is also to be had to those who relate to the Superiors the smallest defects noticed in others; or who, placed in the office of Servitor, Sub-servitor, or Bedel, know how to mortify others, not out of inclination, but from love of religious discipline.

These young persons should be favoured who are relatives of our benefactors or founders, wherefore they should be sent to Rome to study; if they wish to study in their own province, these things should be conceded to them whereby they would be made much of. Let kindness be also shown to those youths who have not yet made resignation of their goods in favour of the Society. After it is done, they may be "dry-nursed" (*post factum, pane non lacte pascendi*). Nor should those have the last place, who, as being well affected to the institution, have drawn over many choice youths to the Society.

16. Of Contempt of Riches.

That no one may ascribe to us inordinate regard for riches, it will assist not to receive mean offerings for the ordinary offices performed by *Ours*. Cheap interments in our temples should be refused; with widows who have exhausted themselves by giving to *Ours*, *They* may act more sharply. The same is to be done with our people who have made a surrender in favour of the Society; the rather when such are dismissed, either by returning nothing to them, or at the very least by deducting well on account of any expenses incurred by the Society on their account.

Superiors should diligently preserve under their own command these Private Advices, and communicate those things to a few, and they grave fathers, who, according to them, should instruct others, in what manner they may serve with gain to the Society; and neither should they communicate them to others as written by any one else, but as if drawn forth of their own especial prudence.

But if (be it far from us) those advices (Monita) should fall into the hands of externs, since these things would be interpreted unfavourably, *They* should deny this to be according to the meaning of the Society, which is to be confirmed by those of *Ours* of whom it is known with certainty that they are ignorant of such (*Monita Privata*), our General advices should be set in opposition to these Private Advices; and our ordinances printed or written, which are repugnant to them. Finally, let inquiry be made whether or not they may have been betrayed by some one of *Ours* (for a Superior will never be so careless in preserving such secrets of the Society); and if against any there shall be even the slightest conjecture, let it be imputed to him, and let him be dismissed the Society.

FINIS.

3 0112 106077057